

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

# The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.  
Prof. W. M. CALDER, LL.D., 5, Derby Road, Withington, Manchester.

All correspondence should be addressed to Prof. CALDER. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

## Board of Management:

Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A., Chairman.

Prof. A. C. CLARK, Litt.D., F.B.A., Hon. Treasurer.

L. WHIBLEY, M.A., Hon. Secretary.

Prof. R. S. CONWAY,

Litt.D., F.B.A.

Prof. H. WILLIAMSON, M.A.

With the Chairman, Treasurer, and Secretary, representing the Council of the Classical Association.

E. A. BARBER, M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society.

D. S. ROBERTSON M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society.

Vol. XLII

NOVEMBER, 1928

No. 5

## CONTENTS

	PAGE		PAGE
KYBELÉ AND GALLOS IN THE HITTITE TEXTS.		REVIEWS (continued):	
A. H. SAYCE .. .. .	161	<i>Struktur und Charakter des Platonischen</i>	
THE WOMEN'S QUARTERS IN THE PALACE OF		<i>Phaidros</i> (Diesendruck). R. HACKFORTH.	181
ODYSSEUS. J. M. WYLLIE .. .. .	163	<i>Hellenica Oxyrhynchia</i> (Kalinka). E. M.	
HERODES II. 6-8. A. D. KNOX .. .. .	163	WALKER .. .. .	182
HORACE, <i>Odes</i> IV. 12. C. M. BOWRA .. .. .	165	<i>The Cambridge Ancient History</i> , V., VI.	
WAS PERSIUS NOT A 'MICHÉRE'? G. B. A.		A. W. GOMME .. .. .	183
FLETCHER .. .. .	167	<i>Isæus</i> (Forster). <i>Eschine I.</i> (Martin and	
FROM <i>The Yeomen of the Guard</i> . J. F. C. .. .. .	168	de Budé). <i>Isocrates, De Pace and Philippus</i>	
THUCYDIDES VI. 64. 1. H. J. ROSE .. .. .	169	(Laistner). J. F. DOBSON .. .. .	189
PLATO, <i>Timæus</i> 37c. EDWYN BEVAN .. .. .	170	<i>A Working Bibliography of Greek Law</i> (Cal-	
WHEN WAS CHARIDEMUS MADE AN ATHENIAN		houn and Delamere). M. N. TOD .. .. .	191
CITIZEN? H. W. PARKE .. .. .	170	<i>The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius</i> ,	
NOTE ON THEOCRITUS X. 26 FF. M. E.		Book III. (Gillies). J. H. E. CREES .. .. .	191
DICKER .. .. .	170	<i>Plutarchi Vitæ Parallelae</i> , III., ii. (Lindskog	
THE RIVER OF TEARS. H. J. ROSE .. .. .	171	and Ziegler). E. HARRISON .. .. .	192
A NEW TITLE OF FORTUNA? H. J. ROSE .. .. .	171	<i>Some Questions of Musical Theory</i> , III., IV.	
NOTE ON METELLUS CELER'S LETTER TO		(Perrett). J. F. MOUNTFORD .. .. .	193
CICERO. R. G. C. LEVENS .. .. .	171	<i>Later Greek Religion</i> (Bevan). A. D. NOCK	194
JUVENAL III. 186-9. J. O. THOMSON .. .. .	172	<i>Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica</i>	
LIVY XLV. 12. W. R. HALLIDAY .. .. .	172	(Fairclough). W. W. GRUNDY .. .. .	194
REVIEWS:		<i>Catullus and Horace</i> (Frank). <i>The Roma of</i>	
<i>The Age of the Gods</i> (Dawson). <i>A Short</i>		<i>Horace</i> (Ingersoll). H. E. BUTLER .. .. .	196
<i>History of Civilization</i> (Thorndike). J. L.		<i>Albii Tibullii Alorumque Carminum Libri IV.</i>	
MYRES .. .. .	172	(Calonghi). H. STEWART .. .. .	197
<i>A History of the Ancient World</i> (Rostovtzeff).		<i>La Technique des Discours dans Salluste, Titæ</i>	
W. M. CALDER .. .. .	174	<i>Live et Tacite</i> (Ullmann). S. K. JOHNSON	198
<i>Color in Homer and in Ancient Art</i> (Wallace).		<i>Die antiken Grundlagen der frühmittelalter-</i>	
M. PLATNAUER .. .. .	175	<i>lichen Privaturkunde</i> (Steinacker). H. I.	
<i>The Ithaca of the Odyssey</i> (Burrage). A.		BELL .. .. .	199
SHEWAN .. .. .	177	<i>Some class-books</i> . W. G. WADDELL .. .. .	200
<i>Pindar: Pythian Odes</i> (Wade-Gery and			
Bowra). D. S. ROBERTSON .. .. .	177	SHORT REVIEWS .. .. .	203-206
<i>Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama</i> (Snell).		SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS .. .. .	206
J. T. SHEPPARD .. .. .	178	BOOKS RECEIVED .. .. .	207
<i>Greek Philosophy before Plato</i> (Scoon). A. E.			
TAYLOR .. .. .	180		

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present Number, 2s. net. Yearly Subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined Yearly Subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

## THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices, provided that the subscriptions be paid before January 31st in each year. Subscriptions sent in later than that date must be at the rates offered to the general public.

Inquiries and applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. F. Hose, Dulwich College, S.E. 21; or to either of the Hon. Secretaries, Dr. E. Norman Gardiner, 186, Woodstock Road, Oxford, and Miss E. C. Gedge, Crayford Rectory, Kent; or to the Hon. Secretary of any of the district Branches—viz., Mr. F. H. Sandbach, The University, Manchester; Dr. G. A. Auden, Education Office, Margaret Street, Birmingham; Mr. R. B. Onians, The University, Liverpool; Professor Granger, University College, Nottingham; Mr. H. A. Pitman, 4, Prince's Buildings, Bristol; Mr. Basil Anderton, The Public Library, New Bridge Street, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; Miss E. J. Vaughan, Westfield College, Hampstead; Mr. L. J. D. Richardson, Fernshaw, Hilary Road, Llanishen, Cardiff; Mr. E. E. Bibby, The University, Leeds; Mrs. Jackson, The Cottage, Cordwell Valley, Holmesfield, Nr. Sheffield; Mr. E. D. T. Jenkins, University College, Aberystwyth; Miss M. E. Lees, University College, Bangor; Miss M. K. Wakefield, Maidstone Girls' Grammar School, Kent; Mr. S. Price, 33, Walton Well Road, Oxford; Mr. J. M. Gaussen, 16, Lewes Crescent, Brighton; Mr. G. W. Dyson, University College, Southampton; Mr. F. Fletcher, University College, Exeter; Mr. C. W. Baty, 49, Waterloo Road, Bedford; and Mr. J. E. Scott, Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge.

## The Loeb Classical Library

Edited by T. E. PAGE, Litt.D., E. CAPPS, Ph.D., LL.D.,  
and W. H. D. ROUSE, Litt.D.

*Each volume, Foolscape 8vo, 400-600 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.*

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The Series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

'We shall never be independent of our Loeb.'—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

### New Volumes Ready October, 1928

*Lucan.* Translated by J. D. DUFF.

*Cicero: Letters to his Friends.* Translated by W. GLYNN WILLIAMS. In 3 Vols. Vol. II.

*Cicero: Verrine Orations.* Translated by L. H. G. GREENWOOD. In 2 Vols. Vol. I.

*Athenæus: The Deipnosophists.* Translated by C. B. GULICK. In 7 Vols. Vol. II.

*Epictetus.* Translated by W. A. OLDFATHER. In 2 Vols. Vol. II.

*Oppian, Colluthus, and Tryphiodorus.* Translated by A. W. MAIR.

*Plutarch: Moralia.* Translated by F. C. BABBITT. In 14 Vols. Vol. II.

*Procopius: History of the Wars.* Translated by H. B. DEWING. In 7 Vols. Vol. V.

*Descriptive Prospectus on Application to*

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey







# The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1928

## KYBELĒ AND GALLOS IN THE HITTITE TEXTS.<sup>1</sup>

WE find in the present text of Hesychius the glosses: Κυβήκη· ἡ μήτηρ τῶν θεῶν καὶ ἡ Ἀφροδίτη, and Κυβήκαι· θεοφορεῖται, κορυβαντιά. It has long been recognised that Κυβήκη must be corrected into Κυβήβη. This is the form given by Suidas (Κυβήβη· ἡ τῶν θεῶν μήτηρ) and Eustathius (Κυβήβη καὶ Κυβήβη, ἡ Πέα), and Hesychius also has Κύβεβις in the sense of a 'gallos-priest' (Κύβεβις· γάλλος, μανιῶν).

The correction has now been confirmed by the Hittite texts. In one of them (KBU XVII., p. 24; *Reverse* III. 10-14) we read: 'One sheep (is to be offered) to the goddess Kubaba and the god Iskalli in common (I LU AN *Ku-ba-ba* I LU AN *Is-kal-li ku-ut-ru-as*), one sheep to the deity Ilaruwa, one sheep to the deity Khilasis (the god of the farmstead), and in addition a bird and a cake, also a sheep to the Sea,' as well as sheep to 'all the rivers of the Hittite country.' With Kubaba we must further connect the Hesychian Κύβαβδα· αἶμα, in which we may have a reference to Attis, the gallos-priest.

The Phrygian name of the goddess was Kybelē, which Greek etymologists derived from 'the caves and rock-chambers' dedicated to the mother-goddess (Hesych.: Κύβελα· ἄντρα καὶ θάλαμοι). Κύβαμος, again, was a title of Attis (Hesych.: Κύβαμος· θεός), and in Lakonia, we are told, κυβαίζοντες was the name given to the fanatics who participated in orgies like those in honour of Attis, Attis himself, it would seem, being identified with Hermēs (Hesych. s.v. κυβαίζοντες). Finally, Hesychius tells us that Κύβα was a 'Syrian (god).'

By the side of Κυβήβη and Κύβα we also find Kombabos and Kombē. Kombabos was the eunuch-priest of Hierapolis, the modern Membij, in Syria, while Κόμβη is stated by Hesychius to

be the 'mother of the Kurētes.' It was not only κύβελα that were the cavern-temples of Kybelē, κύμβος is also defined by Hesychius as κοῖλος μυχός. But the feminine κύμβαι denoted 'birds' rather than 'caves' (Hesych.: κύμβαι· ὄρνιθες, κύμβας· ὄρνιθας καὶ κοίλας). The bird was the symbol of the mother-goddess, and in the Moscho-Hittite hieroglyphs it is employed to represent her. Throughout the Asianic and Mycenaean world the dove was associated with both Kybelē and Aphroditē. In the Hittite texts (KBU V., p. 26. 22) Kubilis 'She of Kubi' is given as a female name.

With Kyba, Kombē, I would identify the Mitannian Khēba, also written Khēbē and Khiba. Khēba was specially the goddess of Aleppo, the north-west Mitannian capital, and she was also the goddess of Tyana, Kybistra ('the city of Kyba'?) and Hydē. In some of these cities she was identified with the Sun-goddess, and was usually entitled 'the queen of heaven.' She was borrowed from the Mitannians by their Hittite neighbours, and so became a prominent Hittite divinity. From the Hittites the name and attributes of the divinity would have passed to the Indo-European Phrygians. Hence the line of derivation would have been Mitannian and Hittite Khēba and Kubaba, and thence Phrygian Kybē, Kombē, and Kybelē.

The name of Attis, Attys, is also found in the Hittite texts. In BKT II., p. 35. 34 we read: 'On the 3rd day it is the turn of the god Atis; and he is called the child of the king for a year; (then) he is given to the supreme goddess (Kybelē).'

In the inscription I have quoted above, Attis appears under the name of Iskallis. The verb *isgall-*, *iskall-* signifies in Hittite 'to cut,' and is used in the Hittite Code of Laws of 'cutting off' the ear. From it was derived the word *iskallissar*, the name of the dress worn

<sup>1</sup> KBU represents *Keilschriftkunden aus Boghazköi* (Berlin, 1921-28); BKT *Keilschrifttexte aus Boghazköi* (Berlin, 1916-21).

by the eunuch-priests. Initial *s* followed by a consonant was written with initial *i* in Hittite, as in *iskham-* 'to chant,' Greek *σκάμνος*, and, as in Greek, the initial *s* tended to be lost. In Greek, accordingly, *isgallas* (also *iskallis*), 'the eunuch,' would become *γάλλος*, and it is probable that the Assyrian *gallu*, 'servant,' had the same origin, being derived from an Asianic form of the word which had lost the initial sibilant. In an Assyro-Hittite Vocabulary (BKT I. 71. 14) *gallu*, 'servant,' is given as the equivalent of the Hittite *miliskus*.

The verb *iskall-* was probably one of the words which came to Hittite from 'Danubian' through Old Phrygian. *Skalmē* was the Thracian word for 'sword' (Hesych.: *σκάλη· μάχαιρα*, *Θράκιος*), and there are two glosses in Hesychius which indicate that *γάλλος* signified 'mutilated.' These are *κέρσης· γάμος* (l. *γάλλος*) and *κέρσαι· κείραι*, *γαμήσαι* (l. *ἀμήσαι* or *Φαμήσαι*). Perhaps *κέρνα· ἄξινη* belongs to the same root. At all events, the name of the Kabeiroi Axio-kersos and Axio-kersa will have been connected with it.<sup>1</sup> M. Autran has shown that the root is one of those common to Indo-European and Semitic (*Journ. Asiatique*, CCIX., p. 47), and probably derived by both of them from Asia Minor. His conclusion is supported by the fact that the usual Hittite verb signifying 'to cut' is *kara(s)*. It has long been recognised that the Greek *μάχαιρα* and Hebrew *mekhērāh*, 'sword,' are identical, though which of the two is a loan-word from the other is a matter of dispute.

The religious use of the verb *isgall-* is illustrated by a passage in one of the Hittite texts (KBU V., p. 30. 24-34) which record the questions and answers put to and given by the seers, more especially those who interpreted the omens furnished by birds. The following is a translation of it (with the omission of some unimportant technical words expressed by ideographs):

<sup>1</sup> Cp. *Kérσης*, the name of a Lydian king according to Nicolaus Damascenus (49). He was the predecessor of *Σπέρμος* (with the variant *Ευπελβος*, for which read *Συπερβος*, *Superbus*). In Hittite *karsis* as an adjective meant 'loyal,' as a substantive 'friend.'

'Then we enquired of the temple-men, and they answered that a dog has entered the temple and licked (*lak-nu-t*) the altar-dish, carrying off the consecrated bread. They have had the consecrated bread cut in a large quantity (*meqqayaz kar-nu-skir*), but the god is angry on that account and there is ill-luck. . . .

'We enquired (again) of the temple-men, and they replied: Two men who are wounded (*kuissantis*) have entered the temple; the bird-omens are unfavourable. . . . Then we enquired of them, and they said that mutilated men (*iskallantis antukhsus*) have gone into the temple. The bird-omens are unfavourable; if on this account the god is angry, the bird-omen will be favourable at first but unfavourable later.

'When the two monthly festivals occur there will be a mutilation (*karsan esta*), and they must soon make an offering (*ispantēr*, Grk. *σπένδω*). If the god does not trouble about them, the bird-omens will be unfavourable.

'When the two monthly festivals occur, they must go early and make a propitiatory offering and sacrifice of a sheep, bread, and beer. Good luck. Soon afterwards they must cut up (*karas-nu-ir*) the daily bread, offering 30 loaves. The bird-omens will be favourable.

'Since the dog had run to the altar-dish they must heap piles of consecrated bread upon the dish; they must twice omit (to offer) the consecrated bread, and must give and sacrifice a propitiatory offering; so the bird-omens will be favourable.

'The wounded and mutilated men (*kuessantes isgallantes antukhses*) have gone before the [Sun-god]. The priestess of the Hittite city has subsequently nursed them (*anniskizzi*). So the matter is at an end.' Cp. Deut. xxiii. 1.

It may be added that in KBU XX. No. 93, vi. 4 mention is made of 'the *iskallis* of the god Ursuis,' the god, that is, of the city of Ursu or Arsus. Kubaba is the Subaraean (Mitannian) goddess Gubaba, identified with Istar by the Assyrians, and invoked along with the supreme god Samnukha (also written Samanminu-khe) by the High-priest of Sadikanni on the Khabour (Essad Nas-

souhi: *Textes divers*, p. 7). Gubaba or Kubaba, the female counterpart of the Kumbabos of Hierapolis, must be connected with Gubarra or Gubára, the wife of the supreme Amorite god

Hadad-Rimmon. The latter was called Dada in Mesopotamia, and Kubaba is accordingly identified with the (Suharaean) goddess Dudu in an Assyrian inscription (Weidner: *Archiv* II., p. 73).

A. H. SAYCE.

## THE WOMEN'S QUARTERS IN THE PALACE OF ODYSSEUS.

PROFESSOR J. L. Myres in *J.H.S.* XX. 136 put forward the view that the women's quarters in the Palace of Odysseus formed a structure separate from the men's μέγαρον.

Seymour, in his *Life in the Homeric Age* (pp. 197-8), objects to this view on the ground that the evidence for it is insufficient. Yet Myres' case is quite a strong one and could be added to by an intelligent reader of *Odyssey*, XXII. 381-401, and it seems to me that the precise significance of one epithet may be held to decide the matter.

In three references to the women's quarters in the *Odyssey*, XXI. 31, XXI. 387, XXII. 399, there occurs the phrase

θύρας μεγάρων εὖ ναιετάοντων.

Now εὖ ναιετάων is used of buildings in *Od.* II. 400-401, IV. 96-98, XVII. 28, 85, 178, 275, 324, XX. 371, XXI. 242, XXIV. 362.

It will be found, if these passages are examined, that the external aspect of the building is in question each time. That is to say, that the person or persons round whom the action of the poem for the time being centres are in a position to view the building, to which this epithet is applied, as a separate object on the

landscape. (In one case this 'viewing' is with the mind's eye—*Od.* IV. 96-98.) I believe that the epithet must be applied to a structure not only standing by itself but seen to do so. Nothing like a phrase ἐντὸς μεγάρων εὖ ναιεταόντων occurs in Homer.

That the verb ναιετάω really means 'to be a conspicuous object on the surface of the ground' is a contention which, I believe, I can prove from a large number of passages in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*; and further, this view of its meaning solves a problem in *Od.* IV. 177, where αἱ περιναϊετάουσιν is said of cities, and in *Il.* IV. 45, where ναιετάουσι πόλεις occurs.

So, since this epithet implies an open-air view of the women's quarters as a separate structure from the men's μέγαρον, and since such a view of them is not possible if they are entered by a door opening from the upper end of the men's μέγαρον or even by a closed-in passage leading from there, we should agree with Myres in regarding the women's μέγαρα in Odysseus' palace, at least, as having had an existence separate from the men's hall.

JAMES M. WYLLIE.

## HERODES II. 6-8.

THE first verses of the Πορνοβοσκός (as now, with slight hesitation, read) run:

Ἄνδρες δικάσται, τῆς γενῆς μὲν οὐκ ἐστὶ  
ἡμῶν κριταὶ δῆκονθεν οὐδὲ τῆς δόξης·  
οὐδ', εἰ θαλῆς μὲν οὗτος ἀξίην τὴν νῆυν  
ἔχει παλάντων πέντ', ἐγὼ δὲ μὴδ' ἄρτους,  
..... ἵππερ' ἔχει βάτταρον τι πημήνας·  
..... [(ν) γε καὶ δεῖ· θῶλυκόν γάρ (ἀν) κλαύσαι·  
..... [αἰρησομαστοσσιας]. . .]ν χῶρη.  
..... ]ος μέτοικος ἐστὶ τῆς πόλιος κήγῳ.

In v. 6 the supplement ἂν was first given by the present writer, to whom the reading of the verse is also due: but by an error γε was read as σγε. Mr. Milne pointed out therefore that πολλοῦ

γε could be read even more easily than παντός γε. In v. 9 μέτοικος is the correct reading of F.D.: and if Crusius' supplement οὗτος is correct we must read now, what is clearly preferable, χοῦτος (both he). I say 'must': since it is clear that πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ must take precedence of all other suggestions, and they must be adopted, whether they be supplements or interpretations, to suit it. Those that cannot be fitted must go: those that can be adapted may be allowed to remain as guesses. For πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ is, in fact, as

essential in a Demosthenic sketch as *ὄνδρες δικασταί, δήπουθεν, νῆ Δία*, the *leitourgiai* and the like. One might almost say that if it does not come here, room must be found for it somewhere else. Let us refer to the list of places where actually it occurs in the speeches of Demosthenes; and if possible track the actual place which Herodes may have had in mind.

The rules as to the use of *πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ* are very simple. Always, as is natural, it follows a negative or negative phrase. It is amazingly frequent in Demosthenes: 63. 7, 115. 18, (132. 2), 174. 17, 175. 6, 189. 2, 241. 17, 242. 25, (326. 2), 328. 4, 373. 14, 384. 4, 390. 22, 439. 20, 474. 21, 489. 11, 537. 13 (*Meid.* 71), 555. 7 (*ibid.* 123), 630. 11, (631. 5), 675. 10, (795. 11), (856. 16), (1046. 19), (1317. 23). It differs not at all from the phrase *οὐδὲ πολλοῦ δεῖ*, which occurs ten times: and like it, indeed like all negatives, it is normally followed by *ἀλλά*: I have put in brackets references where it is not so followed. It cannot be preceded by the *ἀλλά* clause: and therefore *ἀλλ' εἰ*, the HdI.-Crusius supplement in *v.* 6, must go. In its stead we may read, *e.g.*, *νόμον*, which I prefer, *οὕτω*, or, with poor metre, *μὰ Δία* (*Dem.* 189. 2). It can be followed actually with hiatus where there is a change of subject (795. 11). But it is by no means impossible before *γάρ* (132. 2, 856. 16: *cf.* 631. 5): see Hyperid. IV. 7, Kenyon. The actual passage on which we must now base reconstruction of this passage is undoubtedly *Dem.* 1046. 19 (XLII. 25): *ἄξιον ἀφείναι νῦν αὐτὸν εἶναι, ἐπεὶ δὴ χρήσιμος γε καὶ φιλότιμος καὶ τῇ οὐσίᾳ καὶ τῷ σώματι γέγονε; πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ· καλῶν γὰρ κώγαθὼν ἐστί δικαστῶν . . . μὴ ἐπιτρέπειν. . .* Here we have precisely the same balance: *ἐπεὶ δὴ . . .* = *vv.* 3, 4 *εἰ Θαλῆς . . . ἄξιον τὴν νῆν κτλ.*: *ἄξιον ἀφείναι* = *νόμον ὑπερέξει*: *πολλοῦ γε καὶ δεῖ* in both: and finally, 'you must not allow it.' For the rest we get *ηνΚ[αρισομαστοσηιασ[τῶ]ν χωρη*. Here the supplement *ἦν* is due to Blass. *Καρίης* is due to Milne. *ἀστῶν*, for which of course *ἀστῶν* must be read, is my suggestion. All fit the spaces excellently and provide excellent grammar, if we read *ῆ*. Yet what does it all mean?

That a *μαστός* could be a *χώρη* is not impossible. *μαστός* means a hill or an island rising out of the water (Callim. *H.*, iv. 48, Archestrat. *ap. Athen.* 111 F): and there is no absolute reason why Cos should not have been called 'the breast of Caria.' The order which stressed *breast* would have this sense that the semibarbaric Caria would hardly be a land of cities. But there are grave objections. Cos was in fact now synoecised into one city. Actually it is far more simple than that. Sweep away the rather over-recondite *ὁ μαστός* and read *ἑμαστός*. But do not fall (with Herzog) into the error of supposing the word could have meant 'fellow-citizen' at this date. Like *ὁμόπολις* in Soph. *Ant.* 733 (*ὁμ. λεώς*), it means 'united.' The meaning 'of the same city' is later. Then look up Stephanus of Byzantium and you will find (*s.v.* *Κῶς*) that Cos was called *Καρία*, a statement wrongly doubted on the ground of the remark (*s.v.* *Καρία*) that Cos was called *Καρίς*. Finally you need only read

*ἦν Καρίη γ' ἑμαστός ἢ ἀστῶν χώρα*.<sup>1</sup>

and translate 'if Cos be a land of cities united into one city,' or 'if there be a Carian land united of cities.' For that was exactly what happened less than 100 years before the date of this mime; and one may suppose that the phrase actually echoed some formula of the compromise between the old Coan cities when they were reduced in status and combined into one city.<sup>2</sup> Herodes somewhat outruns Demosthenes: instead of saying 'Nay: he will suffer if you are good judges,' he says 'Nay: he will suffer if there be any constitution in Cos.' The difference is not serious: the mock appeal to near antiquity is as

<sup>1</sup> On the technical point Mr. Milne writes: 'I think *Καρίη γ'* could be read as easily as *Καρίης*. . . . The ρ of *Καρίη* is a little to the right of ρ of *οὐρ* [ps]. The ν of *ῆνε* is immediately above α of *Καρίη*.' I assume a gap of four average letters with the ν of *ῆν* written largely and with a space after it, and with the λλ of *πολλοῦ* written close together as μ. This agrees well enough with certain supplements later.

<sup>2</sup> See Nairn's Introduction to Herodas, p. xix, from Paton-Hicks *Inscriptions of Cos*, xxvii., xlix. ff.; Strabo xiv., p. 657, and Diodorus Siculus xv. 76, who, presumably following Ephorus, explicitly dates from this change the golden age of Cos.



sudden, though not quite as irrelevant, as the mock appeal to remote antiquity with which the mime closes. The next verse continues aptly 'And what is Thales' place in the constitution?'

With exactly the same ridiculous exaggeration Herodes' bawd says later that, if such crimes as Thales has done are to go on,

την αὐτονομίην ὑμῶν Θαλῆς λύσει.

Properly read and understood, therefore, this verse introduces an almost essential allusion to Coan history, just as the previous verse introduces an almost essential tag from the Attic orators. Not only is the autonomy of Cos in peril, but the new constitution which ended the old city feuds.

A. D. KNOX.

#### HORACE, ODES IV. 12.

MODERN editors have had little use for Bentley's view that the Vergilius addressed in this ode was the author of the *Aeneid*. Orelli, Page, Gow, Kiessling, Plessis, Ussani, all give the theory short shrift, and even Wickham, after playing with the idea, regretfully abandons it. Their arguments, however, are not conclusive and need some critical consideration. First, little trust can be placed in the identities of this Vergilius given by the manuscripts and ancient commentators. The superscription of the two Paris manuscripts, 7974 and 7971, 'ad Vergilium quendam unguentarium,' bears the mark of pure invention: 'quendam' is a patent confession of ignorance, and 'unguentarium' is an unimaginative deduction from ll. 17-22. Acro's 'ad Vergilium negotiatorem' is equally uninformed and derivative. Nor are other explanations such as 'mercatores' or 'medicum Neronum' really more convincing. The first may well have been derived from l. 25 'verum pone moras et studium lucri,' and the second looks like an ingenious theory intended to give a joint explanation of ll. 19-20 (curarum eluere efficac) and l. 15 (iuvenum nobilium cliens). If the authorities were unanimous in their attribution to another Vergilius, their unanimity might well give force to their statements, but Porphyrio's blank statement 'Vergilium adloquitur' suggests that he means the poet. Secondly, the editors argue, certain phrases in the poem (particularly l. 15 and l. 25) make it unlikely that the poet is addressed. It is claimed that Horace, who had the deepest regard and affection for Vergil, would not have addressed him in terms so unaffectionate, and that neither of

these phrases is in harmony with what we know of Vergil's character. But Horace's wit is thus misunderstood. The two accusations are frivolous, and if to us they seem offensive, it is because ancient wit is the hardest of all things to recapture. Playfulness about personal idiosyncrasies was a feature of Roman literary circles, if we may judge by the letter in which Augustus makes fun of Horace's personal appearance (Suet. *Vit. Hor.*), and Roman poets did not treat their friends with unvarying respect and politeness. Catullus entrusts his last message for Lesbia to Furius and Aurelius (Cat. XII.), but his caustic tongue does not spare them in his sixteenth poem. So in our poem, too serious an interpretation must mean that we grossly misunderstand the ridiculous bargain proposed in it by Horace. Actually the two playful accusations are perfectly in accord with what we know of Vergil's life and character. Allowing for a slight harshness of wit, 'iuvenum nobilium cliens' was a suitable enough phrase to apply to Vergil (Suet. *Vit. Verg.* 9). These 'iuvenes nobiles' were, as Bentley saw, young aristocrats whose favours were much sought (Val. Max. 9. 16; *ib.* 17; Seneca *de Clem.* 1. 9), and here Horace lightly mocks Vergil for his interest in them. Nor need we feel surprise at the command 'pone . . . studium lucri.' Horace proposes a ridiculous and impossible bargain. In return for some cheap wine, Vergil is to bring an enormous quantity of very expensive spikenard. The command to put aside lust for gain is playful enough, but it gets some extra point from the fact that Vergil was a rich man whose modest and retiring life left little room for the



spending of money (Suet. *Vit. Verg.* 13).

The real strength of the case for this poem being addressed to the poet lies in the remarkable reminiscences of his work contained in the first three stanzas. These reminiscences are both of his style and his matter, and so alien are they to the ordinary style or matter of Horace that they suggest that Horace is writing in a Vergilian manner.

First let us consider the vocabulary. In l. 1 'veris comites' is paralleled by *Culex* 1. 344 'comes huic erat aura secunda.' 'quae mare temperat' shows a peculiarly Vergilian use of 'tempero.' When Neptune stills the storm, Vergil writes of him 'et vastas aperit Syrtes et temperat aequor' (*Aen.* 1. 146). This use of 'tempero' is not found in Ennius, Lucretius, or Catullus, and where Horace himself uses it elsewhere (*C.* 3. 4. 45) he is writing his public and patriotic style in which he is most dependent on Vergil. In l. 2 'impellunt animae linthea Thraciae' recalls Vergil's use of 'impellere' in his account of winds driving on waves in *G.* 4. 305 'hoc geritur Zephyris primum impellentibus undas.' In l. 3, 'prata rigent,' Horace uses one of Vergil's favourite words to describe the stiffening effects of frost, as in the description of Atlas (*Aen.* 4. 251) 'glacie riget horrida barba.' In ll. 9-10 'in tenero gramine,' 'tenero' finds its counterpart in the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* as an epithet of grass: *Ecl.* 8. 15 'cum ros in tenera pecori gratissimus herba'; *G.* 1. 112 'luxuriam segetum tenera depascit in herba.' 'pinguium ovium' recalls *Ecl.* 6. 5 'pinguis pascere oportet oves.' 'pinguis' is commonly used by Vergil of domestic animals, whether lambs (*G.* 1. 341; *Aen.* 1. 635), bullocks (*G.* 1. 14), or kids (*G.* 2. 525). Outside this passage Horace does not use 'pinguis' quite like this. His nearest approach is *Sat.* 2. 6. 14, 'pingue pecus facias domino,' where 'pingue' is not decorative but refers to the fattening of the herd.

In vocabulary then we find in these few lines a surprising number of peculiarly Vergilian words and phrases to which elsewhere Horace is a stranger. But in the matter also Horace employs Vergilian memories. The second verse

deals with the age-old story of the nightingale weeping for the murdered Itys. Nowhere else does Horace speak of the nightingale, but here his words are strangely reminiscent of two passages of Vergil. The first passage is in his earliest work, the *Culex*, where he describes Tereus, the father of Itys, mourning for his dead child, 'vox Ityn, edit Ityn, quo Bistonius rex orbis epops maeret volucris evectus in auras' (*Culex* 252-253). Horace makes the mother mourn, and his change may well have been suggested by the lovely and renowned passage (*Georg.* 4. 511-515) where Vergil turns from myth to reality and describes the nightingale weeping for her lost young.

The third verse is full of suggestions of the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics*. Horace mentions Arcadia nowhere else in his works. Perhaps he felt that it was reserved for Vergil's use. But he introduces it here in a setting which calls back many features of Vergil's Arcadia, the home of poetry and music, of Pan and singing shepherds. Here are the 'fistula,' the grazing sheep, and Pan, the shepherds' patron.

That Horace deviated so far from his normal style and his accustomed images needs some explanation, and the simplest solution is that he was writing to please Vergil an elegant lyrical version of Vergilian thoughts and language.

The poem was, of course, like the rest of the Fourth Book, published some five or six years after Vergil's death. There are editors who see in this simple fact an insuperable objection to its being written to the poet. But the Fourth Book is admittedly an anthology, a collection of assorted pieces of very varied character, put together by Horace with the object of swelling his laureate odes on Drusus and Augustus to the dimensions of an ordinary book of verse. To reach these dimensions at a time when he had little interest in the writing of lyric verse, he naturally included poems of temporary interest and imperfect workmanship like the eighth ode. It would be no matter for surprise if he also added this half-colloquial poem, with its jokes about Vergil's personal idiosyncrasies. We cannot tell whether this poem was

written before the publication of the first three books and omitted from them because of its personal nature, or whether it was written subsequent to their publication, shortly before Vergil's death. The probability is that the first three books were published some years before Vergil's death, and that the poem was omitted from them because it was unsuitable for a collection which dealt with matters of more lasting interest than jokes between poets. But when he had to gather his materials at the imperial command for a fourth book,

Horace unlocked his drawers and produced his more trivial and temporary compositions, including this poem. Modern feelings, unused to ancient witticisms, might find some heartlessness in publishing a poem on a dead friend which makes fun of his weaknesses, but Horace had too great a knowledge of friendship to believe that it expects perfection, and no one has urged with more persuasion that we should like our friends for their failings as much as for any other of their qualities. C. M. BOWRA.

### WAS PERSIUS NOT A 'MICHÉRE'?

I HAVE always considered perfectly satisfying the interpretation of the third satire of Persius which is given by Professor Housman in the *Classical Quarterly*, Vol. VII., 1913, pp. 16-18. But Mr. J. Tate makes no reference to it in his note in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XLII., 1928, p. 63, in which he seeks to deny that Persius was a 'michère.' He asks, 'Why should we identify Persius with the *paedagogus* any more than with the pupil?' and comments that, if *Tusculum stemma* in v. 28 counts for anything, he is to be identified 'preferably with the pupil.' It clearly does not occur to him to identify Persius with the *paedagogus* as well as with the pupil, but nothing that he says makes the identification impossible.

Mr. Tate finds a difficulty in v. 47,

quae pater adductis sudans audiret amicis,

because Persius' father is said to have died when his son was about six years old. This difficulty has been raised before by F. Villeneuve in his note on the line in his edition of Persius, published in Paris in 1918, and in his *Essai sur Perse*, Paris, 1918, p. 328.<sup>1</sup> Persius at the age of six would hardly be able to do more than (if as much as) recite a speech ready made for him. In point of fact it looks almost<sup>2</sup> certain

that he was guilty of shirking *suasoriae* in the school of a *rhetor*, and he would emphatically be incapable of *suasoriae* if he was as young as six.<sup>3</sup> It must therefore be allowed that *pater* does not refer to Persius' own father. I think that the true explanation of v. 47 is that Persius is generalising the incident; he speaks, for the moment, in the part of any Roman boy, and, just as the fact of the early death of Persius' father is not necessarily present to the reader's mind, so too Persius puts it from his own mind as he draws his picture.

Mr. Tate says that to imagine that Persius called his step-father *pater* 'would be a truly desperate hypothesis.' But in our own day, at all events, women who marry a second time often encourage their children to call their step-father by the name of father, and I know no reason for disbelieving that the women of ancient Rome did the same. I think, therefore, that it is not impossible, for those who so prefer, to understand Persius as referring definitely to his step-father when he writes *pater* in v. 47.

Mr. Tate speaks of 'other objections' to believing that Persius ever proved a

p. 390, says 'this is no occasion for a *suasoria*,' and it must be admitted at least that the question of the *suasoria* is not beyond all doubt.

<sup>1</sup> Villeneuve is aware of Professor Housman's article (cp. n. 4, p. liii of his edition), but in neither of these two places does he discuss his interpretation of this satire.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Tate says 'all commentators agree' that the boy shirked *suasoriae*. Professor Housman in the *Classical Review*, Vol. XVII., 1903,

<sup>3</sup> Mr. A. D. Nock has pointed out to me that it is *adulescentuli* who are spoken of as being in the hands of the *rhetor* in Petronius, *Satyricon* I. But I think it would be as mistaken to argue from that passage that Persius' *parvus* points to his being under a *grammaticus* as it would be to argue to the same effect by comparing Persius' *parvus* with Horace, *Epistles* ii. 1. 70: *memini quae plagosum mihi paruo | Orbilius dictare*.

'micher,' and it would be interesting to know what these are. In the meanwhile we may be permitted to ask why the story is 'in itself highly incredible.' We may suppose that Persius was clever as a boy, and what is more natural than that a clever boy should prefer games to, and desire to escape from, the pedantry

of a *non sanus magister*?<sup>1</sup> Did Mr. Tate never know that desire?

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

<sup>1</sup> It appears that Persius is guilty of shirking the recitation of pieces of his own composition, and it is interesting to find the frequent practice of such recitation condemned by Quintilian ii. 7 on the soundest educational grounds.

### FROM THE YEOMEN OF THE GUARD

FAIRFAX. A man who would woo a fair maid  
Should 'prentice himself to the trade;  
And study all day,  
In methodical way,  
How to flatter, cajole, and persuade.  
He should 'prentice himself at fourteen,  
And practise from morning to e'en;  
And when he's of age,  
If he will, I'll engage,  
He may capture the heart of a queen!

ALL. It is purely a matter of skill,  
Which all may attain if they will:  
But every Jack,  
He must study the knack  
If he wants to make sure of his Jill!

ELSIE. If he's made the best use of his time,  
His twig he'll so carefully lime  
That every bird  
Will come down at his word,  
Whatever its plumage and clime.  
He must learn that the thrill of a touch  
May mean little, or nothing, or much;  
It's an instrument rare,  
To be handled with care,  
And ought to be treated as such.

PHOEBE. Then a glance may be timid or free;  
It will vary in mighty degree  
From an impudent stare  
To a look of despair  
That no maid without pity can see!  
And a glance of despair is no guide—  
It may have its ridiculous side:  
It may draw you a tear  
Or a box on the ear;  
You can never be sure till you've tried!

ALL. It is purely a matter of skill . . . etc.

W. S. GILBERT.

Quisquis es o pulcrum qui vis ambire puellam,  
 artibus in propriis erudiendus eris.  
 blanditiis uti discere et dare verba dolosus :  
 sedulus haec totos fac meditare dies.  
 hoc studium tiro iam praetextatus adito :  
 hoc orto recolas, hoc abeunte die ;  
 sique voles, simul ac tibi erit toga sumpta virilis,  
 Penelope (certum est) se dabit ipsa tibi.  
 ars amor, ars tantum est, qualem bene discere possis ;  
 quilibet hanc, si vult, se docuisse potest.  
 est opus arte tamen : neque enim nisi capta per artem  
 Gaia se, Gai, dixerit esse tuam.  
 Vtere temporibus sapiens : sollertior auceps  
 nonne vides viscum qua vafer arte paret ?  
 qualibet hic penna quavis de parte volucrum  
 improbus arbitrio cogit adire suo.  
 Sunt quoque deliciae tactus : aut nonnihil ille  
 aut nihil aut multum significare potest.  
 tactus habet pretium, docto dignissimus usu est :  
 nec decet indoctis tangere velle modis.  
 Est sua vis oculis, non est tamen omnibus una ;  
 esse potest audax, esse pudica potest.  
 lasciva huic acies, supplex et flebilis illi est,  
 quamque fleat visam si qua puella videt.  
 nec tamen et supplex acies certo omine vincit ;  
 est ubi ridiculum reddit et ipsa virum.  
 saepe solent lacrimae, colaphi sic saepe moveri :  
 expertus tantum certior esse potes.  
 ars in amore valet : res tota gerenda per artem est ;  
 quique volunt omnes hanc didicisse valent.  
 unica in arte tamen spes est certissima : solum  
 Gaia sic, Gai, se volet esse tuam.

J. F. C.

ETON.

## THUCYDIDES VI. 64. 1.

εἰδότες οὐκ ἂν ὁμοίως δυνήθιντες καὶ εἰ ἐκ τῶν νεῶν  
 πρὸς παρσικευασμένους ἐκβιβάσειεν ἢ κατὰ γῆν ἰόντες  
 γνωσθείεν.

So the MSS.; most editors (Stuart Jones is an exception) emend in one way or another, omitting *καὶ* (Reiske and others), or expanding it to *καθίστα* (Marchant), or altering *δυνήθιντες* to *λυπηθέντες* (Classen, followed by Steup). And indeed, if *οὐκ . . . ὁμοίως* be taken, as apparently the emendators all do, to imply 'less,' one or another of these courses is inevitable. 'The Athenian commanders planned to decoy the Syracusans some distance from their city, and then to sail along the coast and seize a position near the walls, knowing that they would be *not so able* to secure their ends in this way as if they were to march openly by land in face of the Syracusan cavalry, or attack from the sea when the enemy were ready for them,' is as complete a piece of nonsense as ever an ancient author was credited with writing, if we assume that 'not so able' means what it does in modern languages—i.e., 'less able.' But

why make any such assumption? *οὐχ εἰς* means 'many,'<sup>1</sup> unlike English 'not one,' French *pas un*, etc. Aristophanes perhaps may be disregarded when he makes *οὐχ ὥσπερ* mean successively 'less well' and 'better' (*Wasps* 172-3), for the quibble will pass muster in our different idiom also; but Aristotle is not quibbling or joking when he says (*Polit.* 1267a 39) that equality of property will not secure harmony in a state, *καὶ γὰρ ἂν οἱ χαριέντες ἀνακτορεῖν ἂν ὥς οὐκ ἴσων ὄντες ἄξιοι*, 'the better class will chafe under it, considering that they are worth *something more than* equal shares.'

Retain therefore the MSS. reading in Thucydides, and render '(the Athenian generals adopted this plan) knowing that they would be *far better able* to carry it out than if they tried to force a landing,' etc.

H. J. ROSE.

<sup>1</sup> *πάτατος οὐχ ἐνδὲς δορός*, Aesch. *Sept.* 103.

PLATO, *TIMAEUS* 87c.

ὥς δὲ κινήθην αὐτὸ μᾶλλον καὶ ζῶν ἐνόησεν τῶν αἰθίων  
θεῶν γεγονός ἀγαλμα ὁ γεννήσας πατήρ, ἡγάσθη τε καὶ  
εὐφρανθεὶς ἐτι δὴ μᾶλλον ὁμοίον πρὸς τὸ παράδειγμα  
ἐπενόησεν ἀπεργάσασθαι.

IN the *Addenda* of his recent Commentary on the *Timaeus* (p. xiv) Professor A. E. Taylor mentions an emendation which I had suggested to him in regard to this passage. Unfortunately the printer has made nonsense of it. My suggestion was τῶν αἰθίων θεῶν, not θεῶν. I agree with Professor Taylor that it is difficult to attach any meaning to τῶν αἰθίων θεῶν of the existing text, but I cannot think his own supposition that θεῶν is here the genitive plural of *θεῖα*, 'of the eternal spectacles,' a possible one. How could any Greek ever have expected his hearers or readers to understand by θεῶν anything but 'gods,' where there was nothing to warn them of the ambiguity? On the other hand, it seems to me that θεῶν makes excellent sense, and its change to θεῶν by some scribe is easy to account for. God saw the world move and live, 'an image which had come into being, a divine image of the eternal things.' Professor Taylor's objection to this suggestion is that ἀγαλμα already has an epithet in γεγονός, and the other epithet θεῶν would be otiose. This does not seem to me to be so. Plato's point is that, while the world was only an image, only γεγονός in contrast with the αἰθία, it was at the same time an image divinely made and divinely beautiful. The divinity of the image explains the wonder and joy of God spoken of in the main clause. To a word which is relatively depreciative, ἀγαλμα, Plato attaches, by a kind of oxymoron, an epithet which connotes high worth, just as he does, a little lower down, when he calls time an αἰώνιον εἰκόνα of eternity: sometimes it is the substantive which connotes high worth and the epithet which is depreciatory—θεῶν γεννητῶν in 40d. With regard to the eternal ideas being described simply by a neuter plural adjective, we find Plato do this also elsewhere—τῶν νοητῶν αἰετῶν 37a, τῶν ὄντων αἰετὰ μῆμματα 50c. Finally, it is easy to understand some scribe, who did not see that τῶν αἰθίων was a neuter plural and expected a genitive plural substantive after it, carelessly reading θεῶν as θεῶν. How easy such a mistake would be may be seen by the fact that the printer of the Oxford University Press actually changed my θεῶν into θεῶν.

EDWYN BEVAN.

WHEN WAS CHARIDEMUS MADE AN  
ATHENIAN CITIZEN?

KIRCHNER (*Prosop. Att.*, No. 15380), following Schaefer (*Demosthenes* I. 2 419), assigns to 362 B.C. the grant of citizenship to Charidemus. His authority is Demosthenes (XXIII. 151), who concludes his narrative of Charidemus' career down to 362 by saying: ὣν οὖν ἦν δίκαιον ἐκείνον χάριν ὑμῖν ἔχειν οὐκ ἀπολωλῶτα, τοῦτο παθόντ' ἂν δίκαιως, ὥς ὀφείλουσ' ἡ πόλις αὐτῷ στεφάνους καὶ πολιτείαν καὶ ἅ πάντες ἐπίστασθε δίδωκε. But the tense of δίδωκε, taken in con-

junction with the general character of the passage, shows that Demosthenes is not giving this as the next event in time. He is adding a rhetorical flourish, which has no relation to chronology.

This interpretation is proved correct by two passages in the same speech (141 and 203), which say that Charidemus was made an Athenian because of *Cersobleptes*. This would have been impossible in 362. For Cersobleptes did not succeed his father Cotys till 360/59, at which time he was still a mere youth (*μετακύλλιον*, *id.* 163). Also Cotys in 362 was actually at war with Athens, and the state of hostilities continued till 357/6. In what circumstances, then, did Cersobleptes obtain the citizenship for Charidemus?

The second hypothesis to the same speech tells us: συμβουλευσάντος τοῦ Χαριδήμου δοῦναι κοινῇ τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις τὴν Χερρόνησον, ἐπέισθησαν οἱ βασιλεῖς (i.e. Cersobleptes, Berisades, and Amadocus) καὶ δέδωκασιν. τοῦτο γνόντες οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι τὸν Χαριδήμον ἐστεφάνωσαν ὥς εὐεργέτην αὐτῶν χρυσῷ στεφάνῳ, καὶ θετὸν πολίτην αὐτὸν ἐποίησαντο. This would be at the time when peace was concluded in 357/6; and it agrees with our other evidence. The fact that Charidemus did not receive the citizenship till 357/6 should finally disprove the theory that he had ever been an Athenian στρατηγός before he left Thrace for Athens in 351. Also it shows that his activities against Athens were mostly undertaken at a time when he was not bound to her as a citizen.

H. W. PARKE.

## NOTE ON THEOCRITUS X. 26 FF.

Βομβύκα χαρίεσσα, Σύραν καλέοντί τυ πάντες,  
ἰσχρὰν, ἀλιόκανστον, ἐγὼ δὲ μόνος μελίχλωρον.

BOMBYCA'S complexion was severely tanned by working in the sun, and the majority of her acquaintances called her 'Syrian.' Battus alone calls her 'honey-pale.' Most readers of Theocritus naturally assume that μελίχλωρος can by a slight stretch of meaning be the equivalent of 'Syrian'; in fact, that Battus is giving a polite synonym for the rather rude title of 'Gypsy.' This is not really the case. We have many examples of personal description in documents from Egypt which have been discussed and edited by Alessandra Caldara (*I Connotati Personali*, 1924), and in these we find two chief epithets of complexion, μελίχροος and μελάχροος. I think we may assume that μελίχροος and μελίχλωρος denote the same tinge. Signorina Caldara calls it 'pallore olivastro.' But the stock description of Libyans, Ethiopians, and a large number of Egyptians is μελάχροος, and the Scholiast in K remarks on this passage: 'The Syrians are black, like the Egyptians.' So the contemporaries of Theocritus would understand that Battus was giving, not the euphemistic equivalent of 'Syrian,' but the absolute opposite. As Lucretius says (IV. 1152) to the lover:

'Nigra melichrus est.'

M. E. DICKER.



## THE RIVER OF TEARS.

IN Vol. XXXVIII. of the *Classical Review*, p. 113, Professor Calder published a note on Nannakos which embodied a tentative suggestion of mine that in the original Anatolian story the tears of that proverbially lachrymose worthy may have caused the Flood. There is, perhaps, a hint to be gathered from Ovid that similar stories did exist in the Near East.

In his version of the lamentable end of Marsyas (*Metam.* vi. 392 sqq.) Ovid says that the other satyrs, the nymphs, and the country folk wept so bitterly for his death that their tears formed the river since called by his name. But here no one, even of his own fellow-countrymen, agrees with Ovid, unless we count the first Vatican mythographer, who introduces his account with an *alii dicunt* (*Myth. Vatic.* I. 125). The normal story, preserved in so many witnesses that one must suppose it was current in Alexandrian handbooks, is that the river flowed from the blood of Marsyas,<sup>1</sup> much as in the case of Akis<sup>2</sup> when crushed by the Cyclops' huge rock.

Now Professor Calder has elsewhere shown<sup>3</sup> that there is some reason for supposing Ovid to have been acquainted, however he got his knowledge, with an Anatolian folk-tale. It seems to me, therefore, no impossibility that here also he is not drawing purely upon his own imagination to better the current story,<sup>4</sup> but really preserving a detail genuinely Oriental, whether it was originally told of Marsyas or not.

H. J. ROSE.

## A NEW TITLE OF FORTUNA?

DR. R. PARIBENI has published, in *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1927, p. 371, a short but interesting inscription found at Isola Farnese (Veii), concerning which he has most courteously given me some further information by letter. It runs as follows: 'Fortunae/penati (space for two or three more letters) /disque/Cicutii/d.d.' It is cut on a marble slab, 32 × 26 cm. in size. The letters are clear and fairly large, with one ligature, the -ae of *Fortunae*. There is no doubt that the space after *penati* is perfectly blank. The date is uncertain, for a private inscription from a small town cannot be so accurately dated by its lettering as an official one from Rome. It might be anything between the fourth century A.D., and possibly the second; if we take it as being of the third, we probably shall not be far wrong. Who the Cicutii were seems to be quite unknown.

The editor interprets it to mean, 'Dedicated by the Cicutii to Fortune, the Penates, and the (other) gods,' and the last part of this is obviously right. I am, however, less sure that he is correct in taking *penati* to represent

*penatibus*. Having space to spare, why did not the dedicator write *penatib* if that was his meaning? As it is, the word looks like a dat. sing.; I suggest that it really is one.

In the first place, we know that no very sharp line was drawn between the *di penates* and other household gods; *penates sunt omnes dei qui domi coluntur*, says Servius.<sup>5</sup> It is common enough to find quite well-known deities, including Fortuna, depicted on a Pompeian domestic altar. To find Fortuna, then, who is worshipped on occasion as *domestica*,<sup>6</sup> reckoned among the *di deaeque penates*, need cause no surprise.

It is true that the singular of *penates* is used by no author; but it is also true that grammarians asked what it might be, and Festus, drawing here no doubt upon Valerius Flaccus' philological knowledge, corrects the false doctrine of Antistius Labeo, that it was *penatis*, by giving the true form *penas*, and supporting it with the sound analogies *optimas*, *primas*, *Antias*.<sup>7</sup> If anyone wanted to express the fact that Fortuna was one of the deities worshipped at his hearth he might call her *domestica*, as was sometimes done; or he might be correct, if a little pedantic, and call her *penas*. This I think is what the obscure, but apparently not uneducated, household of the Cicutii did. How much luck their goddess brought them in life no one knows; she may at least be credited with having saved their memory from entire oblivion.

H. J. ROSE.

## NOTE ON METELLUS CELER'S LETTER TO CICERO.

*Ad Fam.* V. 1. ad init. (O.C.T.):

'Existimaram pro mutuo inter nos animo et pro reconciliata gratia nec absentem me a te ludibrio laesum iri nec Metellum fratrem ob dictum capite ac fortunis per te oppugnatum iri.'

absentem G: -te MR. me a te add.

Wesenberg.

*Ad Fam.* V. 2. ad init. (O.C.T.) (Cicero's reply):

'Scribis ad me "te existimasse pro mutuo inter nos animo et pro reconciliata gratia numquam te a me ludibrio laesum iri."'

In emending the first of the above passages all editors have taken the same line. The acc. *absentem*, which cannot stand alone, must be fortified in a way which will also account for the variant *absente*. Haplography at once suggests itself, and so we have first *absentem me* (Watson), then more ingeniously *absentem me a te*, which not only repeats the syllable -te, but

<sup>5</sup> On *Aen.* II. 514. See Wissowa, *Relig. u. Kult. d. Römer*<sup>2</sup>, p. 163.

<sup>6</sup> See J. B. Carter, *De deorum Romanorum cognominibus*, p. 41.

<sup>7</sup> Festus, p. 298, Lindsay. The reading in *codem penate*, which some of the older dictionaries quote from Livy XXVIII. 18, 2, is nothing but a very bad conjecture of Sigonius, and false Latin.

<sup>1</sup> References in Roscher's *Lexikon*, II. 2443, 37 sqq. They include Hyginus, *fab.* 165.

<sup>2</sup> Ovid, *Metam.* XIII. 885 sqq.

<sup>3</sup> See *Discovery*, Vol. III. (1922), p. 207.

<sup>4</sup> So it is supposed, for instance, by J. Dietze, *Quaestiones Hyginianae* (Dissert., Kiliae MDCCCLXXX), p. 30.

supplies a phrase answering to the *te a me* of Cicero's reply.

This alteration of the original would make Cicero's reply as given above an exact quotation in reported speech, were it not for the omission of the word *absentem*. Cicero appears in fact to be replacing *nec absentem* by *numquam*, which is hardly a fair equivalent. True, the use of *numquam* solves the problem of a negative which would otherwise be awkward to express in the absence of the second co-ordinate clause; but would Cicero on that account allow himself to omit the emphatically placed word *absentem*? This difficulty leads to the suggestion that editors may have been wrong in assuming that *absentem* is sound merely because it happens to make sense. Metellus was absent in Gaul at the time. But would he be adding any point to his reproach by emphasising this fact? Would he not more probably have laid the emphasis on his surprise that Cicero of all people should have made this attack on him?

I suggest that Metellus wrote *abs te me ludi-brio lacsum iri*. From this it is a short step to the corrupt *absente* of M and R, and the obvious correction *absentem*. The removal of *absentem* takes nothing away from the sense, but gives the personal pronouns a proper emphasis, and brings the sentence into line with Cicero's version of it. It may also be noted that *abs te* is a phrase which dropped out of use during the period of Cicero's letters, and was no doubt characteristic of the generation to which Metellus belonged.

R. G. C. LEVENS.

#### JUVENAL III. 186-9.

Ille metit barbam, crinem hic deponit amati :  
plena domus libis venalibus, accipe et istud  
*fermentum* tibi habe. praestare tributa clientes  
cogimur et cultis *augere peculia* servis.

MOST commentators and translators understand 'accipe . . . habe' as addressed to the client, and *fermentum* as '(cause of) vexation' or the like. Spitzer (quoted by Friedlaender) and Duff make the client speak, and *fermentum* mean 'cake.' Both sides fail to notice a remarkably similar phrase in Petronius 76. When Trimalchio's five ships were wrecked, Fortunata 'rem piam fecit : omne enim aurum suum . . . vendidit et mi centum aureos in manu posuit. hoc fuit *peculi mei fermentum*. . . uno cursu centies corrotundavi.' On this analogy the client speaks : the money he offers is a *fermentum* to raise the slave's fortune, as is further explained by the growling reflection 'praestare . . . servis.' If it is insisted that 'tibi habe' must imply 'I don't want it,' this too can be understood from the client's bitter irony.

Petronius' phrase, ignored by Lewis and Short, appears in *Thes. Ling. Lat.* VI. 527, but quite unconnected with Juvenal's lines, for which the common explanation is (very hesitatingly) adopted.

J. O. THOMSON.

#### LIVY XLV. 12 (C.R. XLII, p. 127).

THE procedure adopted by Popilius was, as Mr. Cameron says, almost certainly oriental, not Roman. The references to the *mandati*, or debtors' circle, are given in Penzer-Tawney, *Ocean of Story* III., pp. 201-202; IX., p. 151; cf. *Folklore* XXXVII., p. 198.

W. R. HALLIDAY.

## REVIEWS

### THE HISTORY OF CIVILISATION.

*The Age of the Gods.* By CHRISTOPHER DAWSON. 8vo. Pp. xx + 446; frontispiece, 3 plates, 10 maps. London: Murray, 1928. 18s. net.

*A Short History of Civilization.* By LYNN THORNDIKE, Ph.D. Large 8vo. Pp. xiv + 619; numerous plates. London: Murray, 1927. 21s. net.

In recent years what used to be called 'Universal History' has come into fashion again, for very good reasons. Most of all it has been popularised in America, where the 'college course' aims at offering the elements of a 'good general education' to those who have the good sense to select them from the bewildering catalogues of 'options.' As in other popular subjects, the result has been a large output of handbooks, embodying the teaching experience as well

as the personal opinions and outlook of their writers, and deserving some day to be studied comparatively. The Professor of History at Columbia University has written already on the History of Mediaeval Europe, and of Magic and Experimental Science, and began his *Short History of Civilization* in 1914 as his contribution 'to keep civilization alive'; and as a manual for college students specialising in scientific subjects, but willing to devote time to their 'background and interrelation,' and for the large class of persons who now visit the Old World without much 'background' at all.

The general plan of the book allows 101 pages out of 567 to primitive culture and the ancient civilisations of the Near East, including the Aegean and

European bronze ages; and 122 to classical civilisation and its decline. Even the old-fashioned 'political and military' history would need to be packed tight in these limits. Professor Thorndike finds room for much more, social conditions, literature, philosophy, sciences and arts; but only by drastic excisions, much use of descriptive examples (supplemented by some good photographs), and some rather loose writing which might easily mislead readers who do not know the subject already. Examples are the description of Western Asia Minor as 'a plain watered by four considerable rivers' (p. 104) and Pergamum as 'near the site of Troy' (p. 145); 'the extent to which the scenery of ancient Hellas stirred the imagination of the Greeks is shown by their mythology and literature' (p. 104); 'it was the usual practice for a Greek colony to have a mother-city' (p. 105); Solon 'adopted a free silver policy, that is to say, a lighter standard of silver coinage' (p. 109); 'ten generals . . . were added to the archons' (p. 110). Some stock phrases, 'buskin,' 'hemlock,' 'phalanx,' survive unexplained; the last-named is used for Spartan and primitive Roman formations. It is an odd literary judgment that the use of Xenophon and Caesar in schools gives 'a regrettable emphasis upon the militaristic side of civilization.' This was all the worse because Xenophon also 'made slips in syntax,' and 'already seems Hellenistic rather than Hellenic.' After the 'Pact,' shall we substitute the *Lysistrata*? In Roman history the method is more successful than in Greek, though the sceptical view of early Roman tradition (p. 174) would have justified even stricter avoidance of its data: a whole paragraph is given to Rome's conquest of Italy, including the Hannibalic War. More satisfactory still are the chapters on the 'Effect of Christianity' and the 'Barbarian Invaders,' where the picture is easier to focus. Occasional modernisms are disconcerting. 'German stock began to rise again' (p. 221) after the battle of Châlons. Though Professor Thorndike expects censure for his 'new organisation of materials, new perspective, and independent historical judgments,' there

is little here that is revolutionary, except the very odd assortment of books in his 'bibliographies.' If yet another motto were required for his title-page, it might be his own comment on the 'royal road to learning' (p. 160), that 'modern democracy needs to realise that there is no popular road either.'

Mr. Dawson's essay is of a different quality. He has limited himself indeed to the history of the pre-classical world, 'The Age of the Gods,' which preceded Hellenic rationalism and the 'humanities' that it created: but he offers us 'universal history,' as Professor Thorndike does, from a similar feeling that the mass of recently discovered material, documentary, philological, archaeological, needs fresh and independent interpretation; and that it is only by an interpretation wide enough to be independent of national limitations, that a historian can escape the distractions of political partisanship: 'the alternative to the nationalist conception of history is the cultural or sociological one which goes behind the political unit, and studies that fundamental social unity which we term a culture' (p. xiii). What a culture is, how cultures change, and what are the causes of that 'exceptional condition' from the historical varieties of which we form our 'abstract idea' of Progress—are the questions which Mr. Dawson sets himself to investigate. Unhampered—we may guess from his method—by limitations of lecture-course or text-book constraints, he is at liberty to discuss current doctrines, to pursue an argument to its conclusion, to vary the scale of treatment; above all, to develop a theory, and something very like a philosophy of history, out of the reasoned analysis of cultural changes with which he begins. This is what makes it worth while to review in this place an essay which deliberately stops just where Greek history and Greek culture begin. For it is as an introduction to these studies, in the only proper sense of the word, that Mr. Dawson's book is likely to make its widest appeal. Earlier cultures, and other cultures at later periods also, have arisen through exploitation of environment, adaptation to a fresh environment after migration, fusion of

cultures through conquest or peaceful contact, diffusion of cultural elements disruptive of the social organisations into which they come: examples of this last are the coming of metallurgy, of agriculture, of the horse, of fire-arms, of European clothes. But even with these characteristics of 'progress' as eighteenth-century philosophers conceived it, 'it is remarkable how often such external change leads not to social progress, but to social decay' (p. xviii.). For moral or intellectual progress, 'change must come from within'; and the self-determining factor, which transcends geographical and ethnological circumstances, and 'increases the range of possibilities in the fulfilment of instinctive purpose,' by a 'continuous process of integration' is Reason 'for ever organising the raw material of life and sensible experience into the ordered cosmos of an intelligible world'; and the 'great stages in world-culture are linked with changes in man's vision of Reality.' In the sixth and fifth centuries B.C., Buddha, Confucius, the Hebrew prophets, and the Greek philosophers (may we not add the Achaemenid application of the teaching of Zoroaster?) exemplify 'the coming of the new vision of Reality,' which revolutionised civilisation. What preceded this 'dawn of a new world' Mr. Dawson describes as 'The Age of the Gods,' a regime of theocracies, great and small,

in the Nearer East, and of cultures farther west which had acquired their higher arts and ideas more or less directly from the same sources, with one (at present outstanding) exception, the 'warrior peoples' whom archaeology and linguistic study alike reveal as intruders into peninsular Europe and Northern India, and uneasy neighbours also for the states of Western Asia.

This is constructive thinking; for though Mr. Dawson does not claim special or intimate familiarity with any of the departments of research from which he draws his data, his information is almost invariably well grounded and adequately wide. He has thought out his problems for himself, and contributed at many points to their solution in detail. And without obtruding the considerations which obviously interest him most deeply, he has used them—and in using tested them—to clarify his presentation of a very large mass of facts, and to suggest fresh aspects in which they deserve to be examined carefully. At several points his argument leads him to the verge of discussion of fundamental problems of Greek life. It is difficult to avoid guessing at the solutions which he might suggest. And it is perhaps not too much to hope that some day he may feel justified in supplementing *The Age of the Gods* by an *Age of Humanities*.

J. L. MYRES.

#### THE ANCIENT WORLD.

*A History of the Ancient World.* By M. ROSTOVITZ. In two volumes. Vol. I.: The Orient and Greece, pp. 418. Vol. II.: Rome, pp. 387. Translated from the Russian by J. D. DUFF. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926-7. Each vol. 21s. net.

A TWO-VOLUME history of the ancient world, from the Sumerians to Diocletian, totalling less than 650 pages of text, 165 of them being devoted to notes on as many plates, and written by a learned archaeologist and an enthusiastic economic historian, might well have been lop-sided and impressionistic; the outstanding impression made by R.'s *History* is the comprehensiveness and

balance of his picture. Stress is indeed laid throughout on the geographical and economic factors which aided or thwarted human endeavour in the Mediterranean area for over four millennia, and there is a richness and aptness of archaeological illustration which places this *History* ahead of all its rivals in the same field. But there are few important movements, and indeed few major events, in political and military history which have not been brought into the picture, and every human activity from bricklaying to drama and from salesmanship to statecraft is discussed and illustrated. The first volume is divided between the Orient (173 pp.) and Greece (215 pp.);



the second volume is devoted to Rome, more space being given to the Empire than to the Republic. Documentation is replaced by illustration.

Space is available only for a few crumbs from a rich feast. History begins, as at present it must, with the Empires of the Sumerians and Egyptians, but R. (Vol. I., p. 79) turns wistful eyes to Central Asia, and looks forward to the day when a proto-Iranian culture will emerge to take its place beside the civilisations of Babylonia and the Nile. The urban settlement (p. 88), the germ of the city state, originated among the Aegeans. Interest in past history and in its monuments is first observed among the Assyrians and Persians (p. 132), and Persia was also the first to devise the heterogeneous empire divided into administrative units which was later imitated by Rome. Greek prosperity (p. 194) was floated on wine and oil; R.'s reconstruction of the economics of early Greek colonisation should be noted. For R. (pp. 378 ff.) Hellenistic culture was not an amalgam of Hellenism and Orientalism, but Hellenic. This is true if account is taken only of urban civilisation; but what place should be given to the Oriental background which never faded out and later asserted itself? R.'s estimate of the achievements of this period is fair and judicious, but 'constructive' describes them better than

'creative.' On p. 378 'Paul' seems to be a slip for 'Luke,' and 'Phrygian and Galatian' for 'Lycaonian.'

In the Roman volume corn, wine, and oil bulk largely, and challenge prejudices. Cato, it is true, had written a treatise on agriculture; but would so sound a die-hard have recognised his *ceterum censeo* translated (p. 98) as 'Carthage, our rival in wine and oil production, must be compelled to grow grain'? Diocletian and Augustus are brought together (p. 320) as men who realised the potentialities of a war-weary world, and made use of them. On p. 291 there is an interesting re-edition of Gibbon's estimate of the Antonine Age, brought up to date by an archaeologist. R.'s theory of the sapping of the Roman Empire by strained relations between town cousin and country cousin can hardly be regarded as established; his insistence on it in discussing the later Empire gives a theory-ridden appearance to this one section of a very fair and objective canvas.

The collection of plates, especially those illustrating the economic life of the Roman Empire, is striking and valuable.

The English is so limpid and natural that the book might have been composed by Mr. Duff himself.

W. M. CALDER.

## COLOUR IN HOMER AND IN ANCIENT ART.

*Color in Homer and in Ancient Art.*

By FLORENCE ELIZABETH WALLACE, A.M. Pp. 83; one colour chart. Northampton, Massachusetts: Smith College Classical Studies, 1927.

IN spite of the care which has gone to its composition it is impossible to accord to this book more than very qualified praise. Viewed as a storehouse of fact for the study of colour in Homer and colour in ancient art (the titles of chapters 3 and 4) the brochure is excellent; useful, too, in the same way are some of the appendices. But the authoress has an axe to grind, and it is doubtful if she grinds it with any

success. 'I undertook the study of the use of color in Homer,' she writes (p. 82), 'with the conviction that its peculiarities were caused by shortcomings in the vision of the Homeric Greeks. But further study of both Homer and modern scientific theories of color have failed to reveal grounds for this idea.' She concludes that 'the colors Homer uses and the colors mentioned by later Greek writers on color show an appreciation of color possibly greater than our own' (p. 83).

It is, of course, open to anyone to believe that a poet who applied the adjective *πορφύρεος* to rainbows, clouds,



blood, and the sea, and χλωρός ('of a color ranging from yellow to bright green') to honey, nightingales, and the pallor of fear had a nice appreciation of colour differences, but it seems on the face of it an unlikely theory. Nor is Miss Wallace always very ingenuous in her arguments. Her main defence of the oddity of some of Homer's colour epithets is that they are used 'conventionally'; she defends κυάνεος as applied to Odysseus' beard by saying that we speak of a dark-bearded man's jaws as blue; and on p. 24 she tells us that 'it is futile to take Homer's fauna and flora too seriously.'

It is difficult to see how the chapter on colour in ancient art helps Miss Wallace's general contention. Short of the Greeks having been totally colour-blind (a view which no one ever has held or ever could hold), the fact that they had artists who painted pictures and sculptors who made coloured sculptures does not prove a modern or ultra-modern sensitiveness to colour differences in the Greeks as a whole. No doubt the artists themselves were, being artists, more sensitive than their fellows, but even they seem to have had their moments of weakness. 'Vegetation is usually brown or greyish blue' (p. 36); 'it seems as though until Roman times very little attention was paid to realistic painting of vegetation' (p. 45); 'the action is splendid' (*à propos* of the Tiryns fresco), 'but the dogs are painted in rose and blue calico patterns while the boar has longitudinal stripes' (p. 36); of the Acropolis pediment sculptures (p. 39), 'one of the horses is painted blue-green'; 'the eyes are of a reddish brown, a favourite color for eyes with the Greeks' (p. 39); and as for hair and beards even Miss Wallace finds it 'hard to believe that the artists ever intended them to be the green or blue they are now,' and postulates 'copper compounds used as a dark pigment which was not lasting' (p. 39).

Such, however, is the authoress's faith in art as illustrative of literature in the way of colour that she furnishes a colour chart, 'worked out originally with a twenty-four crayon box of Dixon's Artists' Crayons,' in which we are given the exact shade of, say, ξανθός. The colours 'are not set forth dogmatically, but are simply put down to aid the reader in visualising the color that I had in mind in each case.' The notes on the chart (pp. 54-56) show how difficult the authoress found this task. 'κυάνεος B' (there are, it seems, two distinct shades of κυάνεος) 'fails to reproduce the effect of blue-black hair, but it may show the color of a mourning garment dyed with woad. By artificial light it is practically black.' χλωρός, too, was troublesome, and Miss Wallace found it 'impossible to try and show the epithet as applied to the skin of a terrified brunette.'

Of the 'modern scientific theories of color' set out in Appendix F, I am not qualified to write. As long ago, however, as 1911 Dr. Myers (*Experimental Psychology*, pp. 29-30) wrote: 'The Urális and Sholagas of Madras have a very definite word for red and a somewhat less definite word for yellow; they have a word for green which may also be used for brown. . . . The Murray Islanders have a definite word for red, two words for orange and yellow, a definite word for green, but no word of their own for blue.' And, *à propos* of Homer, 'these peculiarities of colour terminology occur also in ancient writings in very different parts of the world, for example in the Zend-avesta and the Norse Edda. The conclusion has consequently been drawn that our colour sense has been evolved in comparatively modern times.' It is hard to believe that Miss Wallace's brochure really upsets this view, and the very wealth of her array of facts affords ample material for the refutation of her theory.

M. PLATNAUER.

## THE ITHACA OF THE ODYSSEY.

*The Ithaca of the Odyssey: A New Attempt to show that Thiáki is the Ithaca of Homer, etc.* By CHAMPLIN BURRAGE. Pp. 42. One map and six plates. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, Ltd. 1928. 4s. 6d. net.

THE author's conclusion, based on a personal exploration of Thiáki last year, is that it is 'the true Ithaca of Homer,' and that 'the island in general meets admirably both the geographical and topographical allusions of the *Odyssey*.' But he also finds, in rather summary fashion, that Leukas is the Homeric Samé, a view which has recently been ably advocated, though with a calamitous straining of the meanings of a number of Greek words—*πορθμός*, for example, has developed from 'strait' through Dörpfeld's *Wasserweg* into 'trade-route'—by Mr. Frank Brewster in *Harvard Studies and Classical Philology*. This is mainly due to the author's acceptance of Dörpfeld's 'discovery' that Arkoudi is the Homeric Asteris. But, as Bérard has shown, the description in the *Odyssey* does not fit it; the 'havens' discovered are to the same authority quite impossible; it is probably the Krokyleia of the Catalogue; the Wooers could never

have selected it as a good place for an ambush; and, if it be Asteris, Athene's instructions to Telemachus at Sparta are hard to understand. That its rival, Daskalio, has not 'twin havens' now is no difficulty, for it was certainly larger three thousand years ago, and it can be shown to be probable that it had havens on its shores, not the best imaginable, but good enough for the poet's purpose, and with this advantage, that they were much nearer the capital than Arkoudi. Mr. Burrage seems to think *μεσσηγὺς* (*Ἰθάκης τε Σάμοιό τε*) of Asteris must mean 'exactly midway,' but that is not so. Compare, as one out of many instances, *Ω 78*, of the plunge of Iris into the sea.

The rest of the pamphlet is devoted to the identification of Homeric sites on Thiáki, and there is little to which exception can be taken. On one point, the location of the capital town and the palace of Odysseus, authority is at present against Mr. Burrage. He hopes that thoroughgoing excavation may yet be undertaken, but is it not the case that the archaeologists are satisfied that stonework must have vanished through cultivation and denudation of the slopes?

A. SHEWAN.

## PINDAR'S PYTHIAN ODES.

*Pindar: Pythian Odes.* Translated by H. T. WADE-GERY and C. M. BOWRA. Pp. xlv + 165. London: The Nonesuch Press, 1928. 12s. 6d. net.

THIS exquisitely produced little book contains a Preface and Introduction, translations of all the *Pythians* in chronological order with explanatory prefaces, and Appendices, but no attempt at a running commentary. The text, with eight variations recorded on p. 155, is that of Schroeder's *editio minor*, and there are no new conjectures. The printing is admirable, but there is an unfortunate misprint (489 for 480 B.C.) on p. 156.

The *Pythians* is undoubtedly the best calculated of the four books to give a general view of Pindar's life and work, since it contains his earliest and latest

dateable poems, as well as characteristic examples of his central period. Unless, however, this volume is to be followed, as every reader must hope, by three companions, it is regrettable that the translators did not prefer a selection from the whole corpus, including at least the first two *Olympians*, which would have made the admirable and original Appendices on Pindar's Sicilian visit more living to the ordinary reader.

The translations, in a free metrical form without rhyme, are extraordinarily successful: the best are perhaps the Fifth and Ninth. Nothing hitherto attempted comes at all as near to giving the Greekless student some conception of Pindar's power and charm. In the more difficult places excellent judgment is always shown, and there is much inter-

esting new interpretation, especially of the Second and Fourth Odes. Medea's prophecy is explained as *apologia* for unfulfilled oracles of fifty years before; but this view depends upon a sharp contrast between the promise of all Africa to Euphamos and the promise of Cyrene alone to Battos, which is not very easily found in the text.

The Introduction gives a vivid account of Pindar's life and work, inevitably influenced by the great work of Wilamowitz. Its chief faults are a rather tiresome man-of-the-world tone about Lord's and the Grand National, and an attitude of patronage towards Pindar's character and intellect. For all his Dantesque spurts of personal explanation Pindar is profoundly reserved, and to say (p. viii) that 'the character his poems reveal is so simple, so childish, that a few lines tell everything' is far from the truth.

In some points the translators are definitely unfair. They consistently minimise Pindar's interest in Greek freedom, writing for instance (p. viii) 'he hardly believed in the cause of Greece against Persia.' Yet, for a loyal Theban, his noble eulogies of Athens, as late as the First Pythian of 470, show an extraordinary courage which deserves less grudging recognition. Again, they exaggerate his admiration for mere wealth: it is not true (p. 62) that it is on Hieron's wealth that Pindar 'pivots his consolation' on the Third Pythian: he pivots it on his kingly office, a very different thing. Also they stress too much his exclusive love of the nobles: at least, their language would suggest a caste far more remote from common men than the aristocracy of little Aegina can well have been; and Aegina, after Thebes, was of all cities the dearest to Pindar's heart. They seem also scarcely to appreciate Pindar's magnificently

reserved and elaborate structure, especially in such great odes as the First Pythian: to say that Pindar's work 'is not a statue but a mosaic' (p. xxxvii) is at least misleading.

A few detailed criticisms may here be added. It is rash to conclude (p. 18) that Pindar wrote no elaborate epinikia for long years after 498. He was a beginner, and much may have perished: the translators themselves remark (p. 32) that the Seventh Pythian of 486 'has survived because Megakles was an important man.' It is hardly true to say (p. xi) that belief in the gods' jealousy of men 'recurs throughout Pindar's poetry.' It occurs, as they say, in his earliest poem, but, with the doubtful exception of *Ol. XIII. 25*, nowhere else except possibly in the last: and his careful avoidance of such expressions in the interval throws some doubt on this interpretation of *ἀφθονον* in *Pyth. VIII. 71*, where the word in the best MSS. is in any case *ἀφθιτον*, though the paraphrase has *ἀνεπίφθονον*. It is unfair to gibe at Pindar (p. xliii) for 'never turning travellers' experience to his own profit, but acquiescing in the tradition which told that in Egypt women were married to goats.' Herodotus (II. 46) says that *ἐπ' ἐμεῦ* this happened *ἀναφανδόν*, and How and Wells write 'the fact is probably true.' In the excellent introduction to the Eighth Pythian there seems to be some confusion between *Ἀσυχία* and *Εἰρήνη*: it is difficult to see how else to justify the heading 'Peace,' or to suggest that Aristomenes 'was spoiling for a fight with Athens' and that Pindar 'called him off.' *Ἀσυχία* concerns the relations between classes within the state, and the poem is a call to unity, not a call to peace: the 'saints' of the close, Aeacus, Peleus, Telamon, and Achilles are saints of war.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

#### AESCHYLUS AND TRAGIC ACTION.

*Aischylos und das Handeln im Drama.*

By BRUNO SNELL (Philologus, Supplementband XX, Heft I). Pp. 163. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1928. Geheftet, RM. 11; gebunden, RM. 13.

THE whole book is worth reading, and it is a pity that the first chapters are

the weakest. The attempted reconstruction of the history of the words *δρᾶν* and *δρᾶμα*, though more cautious than the author's earlier attempt to claim for Attica the word and the conception *ἐπιστήμη* (see Burnet's notice *C.R. XXXIX. 127*), is marred by special pleading and is careless in detail. On

p. 8 we are told that *δρᾶν* is common in Xenophon; on p. 10 that Xenophon 'patently' avoids the word. The argument is inconclusive, and adds little to the statement of the problem made by H. Richards nearly thirty years ago (*C.R.* XIV. 393). But the linguistic argument is comparatively unimportant. Mr. Snell may or may not be right in his opinion that the word *δρᾶμα*, as applied to tragedy, has reference not to ritual origins, but to the tragic hero's voluntary act, to his decision, taken in the face of circumstance and executed with or without full knowledge of the inevitable, fatal consequences. Anyhow, the distinction on which Mr. Snell insists between the lyrical *ἀμυχανία*, which says, 'What will become of me?' and the tragic hero's cry, *Πυλάδη, τί δράσω*; is, as he says, of great importance for the student of the Attic drama and of the Athenian mind. When he emerges from the labyrinth of dubious lexicography and tries to analyse the extant plays with special reference to the development of this notion—the conception of the hero as a person consciously determining his fate by choice and act—Mr. Snell becomes not merely entertaining and suggestive, but illuminating. He makes in fact a solid contribution to the understanding of Greek poetry.

That is my general impression, but it is often difficult to follow Mr. Snell in his analysis even of familiar texts. Too often his argumentative enthusiasm and his liking for a clear-cut theory disturb his judgment and appear to cloud his vision. A strict comparison between the processes by which Homeric heroes are impelled to action and the ways in which the Aeschylean characters behave would be instructive, and would certainly embody many of Mr. Snell's suggestions. But a comparison of *Il.* XVIII. 79-104 and *Od.* XX. 9-42 with Mr. Snell's account of these two passages will put the reader on his guard. To say that Homer's Achilles 'has no choice,' so that Socrates was wrong in thinking him a hero who chose death rather than shame, is silly, though the folly sounds impressive in the form 'Im Epos gilt nur die Notwendigkeit der sich das Subjekt fügt,' etc. To

underestimate the tragic psychology of Homer, to treat him as a 'primitive,' in comparison with whom even the early Aeschylus is modern, is doubly misleading. It blocks the way to understanding of the greatest of all narrative poets, and it hinders our appreciation of his influence on his successors, above all on Aeschylus. Mr. Snell denies that Homer's Hector and Achilles are in the strict sense tragic personalities. It would be nearer the truth to say that from the study of Homer Aeschylus first learnt how to create a tragic character. A similar tendency to exaggerate and generalise mars the statement of a perfectly good case when Mr. Snell compares the early with the later Aeschylus. The women in the *Suppliants* are certainly a prey to fear. Their dominant mood indeed well illustrates the contrast of the lyrical *ἀμυχανία* with the tragic hero's question, 'What am I to do?' But to talk of them as if they were incapable of action, and to speak as if the *Hubris* in this trilogy were all on the Egyptian side, is to ignore not only many difficulties which the sequel must present on such an hypothesis, but many of the most dramatic moments in the extant play. These women mean to kill themselves if they are unsuccessful, and their energy shows that, if need be, they will do it. All their talk about *Sophrosyne*, all their reliance on the gods and on their excellent *Boularchos*, does not, for an unbiassed reader with no theory to prove, dispel the impression—which Aeschylus as a dramatist was at pains to make clear—that these women, though they say there is no *Ares* in a woman, are capable in the last resort not only of decision, but of execution in the grimmest sense of the word. On the other hand, we are asked to think that in the *Septem* all the *Hubris* is on the side of the hysterical women. In fact the scene with the women reveals Eteocles not only as an heroic patriot, but as a passionate human creature, lacking just that self-control which, at the moral crisis, might have saved him. The hero is more sympathetic, less 'ideal' perhaps, than many German critics wish us to suppose. Nevertheless the main argument of the book is sound.



Chapter by chapter it improves, and the appreciation of the *Oresteia* throws new light both on the form and on the content of the masterpiece.

Finally, I should venture to protest against the tacit refusal to accept the

light thrown on the text by Headlam's work were it not that even Cambridge examiners have the habit of setting to their Tripos candidates as 'Aeschylean' sentences and even paragraphs that are not Greek.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

#### GREEK PHILOSOPHY BEFORE PLATO

*Greek Philosophy before Plato.* By ROBERT SCOON. Pp. 353. Princeton: Princeton University Press (London: Humphrey Milford). 16s. net.

MR. SCOON has written a pleasant and readable book covering very much the ground of Professor Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy* and the first part of the same scholar's *Greek Philosophy, Thales to Plato*. In the main Burnet's exposition is followed, often with a verbal fidelity rather more close than is usual except where dependence is indicated by the employment of quotation-marks. This is, no doubt, to be explained by the consideration that the substance of Mr. Scoon's book was originally composed as a 'doctoral thesis.' In the main the reader will carry away much the same presentation of the history of early Greek philosophical and scientific thought as that of Burnet, though naturally much of the evidence for conclusions on disputed points is only briefly indicated by Mr. Scoon. Where Mr. Scoon deserts his chief authority on minor points I doubt if he is usually well-advised. He is, I am sure, wrong in retaining the erroneous dating of Anaxagoras which was carefully corrected in the third edition of *Early Greek Philosophy*. It is as demonstrable as anything of the kind well can be that Demetrius of Phalerum was right in making the thirty years of that philosopher's life in Athens begin in the year of Salamis (Anaxagoras may, in fact, have originally come to Athens in the train of Xerxes). This date explains what would otherwise be the surprising statement of the *Phaedo*, that Socrates first learned Anaxagoras' theories about *νοῦς* from hearing his book read aloud by 'some one.' The book must have been produced at Lampsacus, after the philosopher's flight from Athens. I do

not find it as incredible as Mr. Scoon does that Plato should not have heard of Democritus and his works. After all, communication with Abdera would not be as common after Athens had lost her hold on the north in the Archidamian War as it had been in the days of Protagoras. I should not, however, like to deny that Plato may, as Mr. Scoon holds, have known of Democritus, but not been sufficiently interested to mention him. Only, if this is true, I should suppose, as I know Burnet did, that the lack of interest arose from the knowledge that Democritus was an earth-flattener. I doubt again whether Mr. Scoon has given a wholly coherent explanation of the interpretation he puts on Parmenides' 'way of opinion.' He seems to be trying to conflate two very inconsistent views, that Parmenides regarded the cosmology he describes there as simply false, and that he thought it at any rate 'plausible.' It seems to me that Burnet's explanation, that Parmenides felt bound to justify his 'conversion' by contrasting the error from which he had escaped with the truth he had reached, still holds the field.

There is one divergence from Burnet which would be of great importance if the case for it could be successfully made out. Mr. Scoon regards the fragments of 'Philolaus,' or at least those accepted by Zeller and Diels, as genuine, and attempts to use them for a reconstruction of a 'Philolaic' philosophy which, he holds, very directly influenced Socrates, and through him Plato and the Academy. In this new account of Pythagoreanism, the formula that 'things are numbers' is regarded as quite late, being ascribed in particular to Eurytus, the disciple of Philolaus. Philolaus himself is credited with a belief in 'forms' not unlike those spoken of by Socrates in Plato's dialogues, with the



difference that *his* 'form' is not a universal but varies with the object in which it is embedded; it is also assumed to be an 'active principle' and a 'force.' I cannot here discuss these suggestions fully, but the evidence for the construction seems very dubious. Mr. Scoon leaves untouched the greatest difficulty raised by acceptance of 'Philolaus,' the apparent complete ignorance of him shown by Aristotle. It is true that Aristotle 'was confused' about the Pythagoreans, but the fact that he was is a fair proof that there was in his time no work by a fifth-century Pythagorean extant. To get the doctrine expounded out of the fragments I note that Mr. Scoon has to render their technical word *περαιννοτα* in an active sense, 'limiting'; is it not more probable that the sense of the participle is intransitive, so that the supposed distinction between the *πέρας* of Pythagoras and the 'limiting things' of 'Philolaus' disappears? Finally, for the most important point of all, the contention that the 'forms' of Philolaus were 'active' forces, there is no evidence beyond the assumption that when Cebes in the *Phaedo* speaks of the soul as weaving its own body he is echoing Philolaus, and that what is said of the soul by him may be combined

with what Simmias says of it as a 'harmony.' That the doctrine of Simmias is Pythagorean Plato has indicated by making Echecrates speak of his own leaning to it; we also know that it was maintained by Aristoxenus. We have no such evidence to go on for the source of Cebes' illustration. It is also, to my mind, a grave difficulty in the account the author gives of Pythagoreanism before Philolaus that it at least seems to make 'the unit' an *ἀρχή* (p. 42), whereas the standing tradition is that the Pythagorean 'unit' was regarded as the 'first blend' of the *ἀρχαί*. I do not see how this is compatible with the two assertions that the 'limit' was Fire (p. 39), and that 'the original one was identified with the original mass of fire' (p. 42). The second statement can hardly be true.

The book is in general excellently printed, but I note two unfortunate oversights, the statement that Democritus was a younger contemporary of Plato (p. 111, n. 8), and the ascription of medical works to Hippocrates of Chios (p. 198, n. 9). And I wonder whether the author's trick of spelling 'God' with a small *g* is supposed to be humorous.

A. E. TAYLOR.

#### PLATO'S PHAEDRUS.

*Struktur und Charakter des Platonischen Phaidros.* Von Z. DIESENDRUCK. Pp. 56. Wien und Leipzig: Wilhelm Braumüller, 1927. M. 2.70.

WHAT is the subject of the *Phaedrus*? Are there two independent subjects, Love and Rhetoric, or is there some real bond of union between the two halves of the dialogue? This familiar question is re-discussed by Professor Diesendruck in a highly compressed essay, but it can hardly be said that any very definite answer is given. Chapter I. gives a short review of the literature of the subject; no mention is here made of W. H. Thompson or J. A. Stewart, nor indeed of any foreign writer save Lutoslawski. Chapter II. begins with some sound remarks as to the kind of unity for which it is reasonable to look in a Platonic dialogue; but the

short paragraph at the end of the chapter where the author sums up his conclusions as to the 'Grundzug' of the *Phaedrus* is vague and obscurely expressed, and will, it is to be feared, leave the average reader with the problem unsolved. Nevertheless this chapter contains much acute criticism and analysis, and helps to knit the dialogue together by noting correspondences, usually missed, between the first speech of Socrates, the Myth, and the discussion of Rhetoric. We cannot agree that the whole structure of the dialogue rests on the doctrine of the tripartite soul, and it is surely mistaken to support this assertion by attempting to find three kinds of *ἔπος* distinguished: there are only two, as is made quite plain at 266A; philosophic *ἔπος* is no more than a perfected or

sublimated form of *παιδευασία*, and the 'divine madness' equally inspires both. In discussing Socrates' first speech the writer accepts Joel's suggestion that Antisthenes is parodied; but if so, why is Socrates made to say twice over that the author of the speech is really Phaedrus himself? We can hardly turn Phaedrus into a Cynic.

Chapter III. discusses the position of the *Phaedrus* in relation to other dialogues, and is particularly valuable

in contrasting the conception of Love in the *Symposium*, and the proof of immortality in the *Phaedo*, with the corresponding sections of the *Phaedrus*. The author, while prudently declining to fix the date of composition, argues—rightly, we think—that it is later than the *Republic* and has affinities with the thought of Plato's old age as expressed in the *Timaeus* and *Laws*. It is unfortunate that there are so many misprints in Greek words.

R. HACKFORTH.

#### KALINKA'S HELLENICA OXYRHYNCHIA.

*Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. Edidit ERNESTUS KALINKA. Pp. xiv + 63. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927.

THIS edition of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia* contains, in addition to the text of the Fragment, five pages of preface in Latin, together with a complete bibliography of the literature of the subject down to the year 1926, with an indication of the view taken in each case as to the authorship. At the end of the book we are furnished with the text of the passages in Diodorus, Xenophon's *Hellenica* and *Agagilaus*, and in various other writers, Greek and Latin, which are relevant to the period covered by the Fragment. The printing of these passages in full is extremely convenient for purposes of reference.

The editor's own view as to the authorship may be gathered from his preface. He gives up Theopompus as a bad job, and decides in favour of Cratippus, although he admits that, as between Cratippus and Ephorus, 'adhuc sub iudice lis est.' The two considerations which he regards as decisive against Ephorus are, in the first place, Schwartz's dogmatic assertion, 'wenn irgend etwas feststeht, so ist es das, dass E. die annalistische Form der Stadtchronik verschmäht hat,' and in the second, that 'hiatum non tam severe vitavit, quam a scriptore qui inter Isocrateos numeratus est expectes.' In spite of these two arguments, the present writer remains impenitent.

It is noteworthy that since 1910 Theopompus has found only two or three fresh champions. If we are to go by votes, Cratippus has now a decisive majority.

In regard to the text, there are two points that call for notice. It is unfortunate that the editor has departed from the usual practice in his use of square brackets. When we find letters enclosed in such brackets we naturally assume that they are missing in the papyrus, and that they are a conjectural restoration of the text. In Kalinka's text, however, square brackets are employed to indicate a correction of what is found in the papyrus, as well as a restoration of what is absent. Such a use of these brackets is apt to convey a misleading impression of the actual state of the papyrus. Secondly it is to be regretted that the editor has restored the text, or adopted the restoration of other scholars, on so lavish a scale. Long *lacunae* are filled up with supplements about which there is no evidence. In some cases at least, the sense that results is feeble, and the Greek odd; but, even where the sense is tolerable and the Greek without offence, what, it may be asked, is the value of these hazardous reconstructions? The worst of it all is that the supplements will be quoted for purposes of historical evidence as carrying with them the respectable authority of P.

E. M. WALKER.

## THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY.

*The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. V.: Athens 478-401 B.C. Pp. xxii+554; 14 maps, plans, etc. 21s. net. Vol. VI.: Macedonia 401-301 B.C. Pp. xxiv+648; 10 maps, plans, etc. Cambridge: University Press, 1927. 30s. net.

WE are in a different world in these volumes. The main lines of the story and much of the detail have long been settled. There is not the same scope for conjecture and the play of fancy in dealing with either Thucydides or Xenophon (though for very different reasons in the two cases) as with Herodotus. Thucydides is overwhelming; he has imposed his view of events on all posterity, which can attempt little else but variations in its rendering of his history—one feels that Professor Ferguson breathes more freely when Thucydides first becomes difficult and then is left behind. The greater part of recent work on the fifth and fourth centuries has consisted in filling in some of the gaps left by Thucydides, sifting and rearranging the evidence of Demosthenes and Aeschines, and the like—careful and laborious work, mostly on inscriptions, such as that of Meritt and West on the quota-lists, or of Cloché on the chronology of 350-330 B.C. It is clear that this great mass of writing has been carefully studied and digested by the various authors of these volumes, that the latest knowledge available is incorporated. It is reliably done; and since no other recent history of Greece on this scale, in English, exists, the importance of these two volumes is obvious. There is not much in them that is novel in interpretation, not always a true insight into the meaning of events, not always very clear or vigorous writing (Professor Ferguson is the most eloquent). But it is very competent; it predisposes the reader to just that confidence which Professor Bury would have desired. But we had hoped for something more.

To begin with a former complaint of mine—the sources. Before every chapter, or group of chapters, there is a footnote on the sources; but practically no attempt is made to appraise

them (through no fault of the different writers: they had not the space—the best, because the longest, is Mr. Tarn's, for Alexander). How profoundly different, in its very nature, is our evidence for the different periods of Athenian history—the Pentekontaetia, for example, 431-411, 411-362, and 362-322 B.C. How different is the evidence for Athens and that for Sparta and Sicily. And this difference is not only of importance for our understanding of the narrative of events, but interesting in itself: it is not without significance that the historians of the first half of the fourth century were inferior to the historian of the Peloponnesian War, and that those of the Demosthenic period were what (as far as we know) they were and that their works have perished, though so greatly influencing the extant writings of a later age. The defect in Vol. V. is to some extent made good in the cases of Aristophanes and Thucydides by Mr. Sheppard's chapter on the Drama and Dr. Macan's on Herodotus and Thucydides; but we have no account, for example, of the omissions in the latter's narrative, no account at all of Xenophon or Ephorus, no valuation of Demosthenes as historical evidence (I do not mean of his statements about this or that meeting of the ecclesia in 346, but of the *corpus* of speeches), and, by the way, nothing about him as one of the three supreme masters of Attic prose—a remarkable omission. Theopompus is barely mentioned throughout the two volumes. Instead we have only notes such as the following:

The continuous ancient sources of the narrative of this chapter are Thucydides I. 115-17, 23-88, 118-46; II. 1-6; and the portions of Diodorus XII. 9-42 which refer to Greek affairs. These latter are mainly derived from Ephorus. Plutarch, *Pericles*, supplies some independent information. For further details, especially of inscriptions, see the bibliography—

—the bibliography of course only giving references to *I.G.* and to modern writers. But what are inscriptions? What sort of official documents do we possess, and how complete are they? The narrative of the chapter implies a class of readers who are ignorant of,

but desire to know, the course of events of these years; but this note implies that they already know all about Ephorus, Plutarch and Attic inscriptions, or are quite incurious. Mr. Tod gives us something, but not nearly enough.

This mistake in the arrangement of the work naturally also affects every passage in the narrative (and they are many) in which a doubtful matter is argued according to the different authorities. To take what is in itself an interesting discussion—Mr. Walker's note on the supposed ascendancy of the Areopagus 479-462 B.C. That this note is intended for the general reader, and not for the scholar only, can be seen from such a sentence as: 'Clitodemus was apparently the earliest of the *Atthidographs*, i.e. of the composers of a new form of historical literature which is known by the name of *Atthis*, or *History of Attica* [*History of Athens*, it should be]. His work may be assigned to the first quarter of the fourth century B.C., . . . and it is thus about fifty years earlier than Aristotle's *Constitution*.' He then contrasts the two versions of the way in which the manning of the Athenian fleet in 480 was achieved, and concludes:

When we compare the sparkling wine of Clitodemus with the flat, vapid stuff presented to us by Aristotle, we need little critical insight to detect which is the original tale, to the greater glory of Themistocles, and which its refutation in the Conservative interest.

This at the end of a volume in which there has been no mention of any *Atthis*, no account of the development of history in the fourth century. How is the general reader, I will not say to judge this argument—he is not in the position to do that in any case—but to follow it?

There is a point, by the way, in this dispute about the Areopagite revival which has so far been overlooked. According to Aristotle, the generals were completely helpless in the crisis of 480, and the Areopagus saved the situation. 'Who can these generals be but Themistocles himself?' says Mr. Walker, naturally. But Themistocles was also a member of the Areopagus. So was Aristides, who, though in exile, was

doubtless able to influence events from Aegina through his friends on the Council. The great majority of the members must have been influential and prominent men, elected between 507 and 487, for the lot in the election of archons (that reform of primary importance to the development of Athenian democracy which is as much neglected in the Cambridge History as in the *Constitution of Athens*) had only been in use for seven years; and though we cannot take at all seriously Aristotle's account of this crisis and the subsequent predominance of the Areopagus, yet Themistocles may well have exercised his immense influence through this still powerful Council (perhaps the Boulé of Five Hundred behaved weakly), and some such fact may be behind the story.

The difficulties of multiple authorship are obvious and need not be insisted on; the editors were aware of them before they began their project. In the continuous narrative of political events they are often not serious—the break between Professor Adcock and Professor Ferguson at 421 B.C., for instance, does not do much harm; for Thucydides is behind them both. But it is another matter when different aspects of the same period are treated: then the discontinuity is obvious; and there is one instance in particular in these two volumes which cannot be ignored. Vol. V. opens with a chapter by Mr. Tod, 'The Economic Background of the Fifth Century'—32 pages: as we should expect, a competent and careful piece of work within its limits. There is no corresponding chapter in Vol. VI. for the fourth century. In the first place, this leaves us to assume that there were no changes in population, in prices, in conditions of labour: on all of which we have some evidence, though tantalising in its defectiveness; and secondly, we are told next to nothing about any state but Athens. This is not Mr. Tod's fault—he was not given the opportunity; but it is depressing, for instance, to find nothing more than that the population of Athens was probably such and such in 431, and declined greatly during the Peloponnesian War. (I believe personally that, in a history of this kind



and scope, it is more useful, more informative to the general reader, that important questions on which there is some evidence, but defective and disputable, should be discussed at length and the evidence given; space could be saved on some of the less important military campaigns and the political views of obscure generals—about which we know a good deal less than about wages and prices.) Thirdly, Mr. Tod's chapter does not, in fact, serve as a background to the political events treated in the other chapters, which completely ignore him. They are all written as though their authors had been warned that they need not mention, or even think about, economic conditions: Mr. Tod is doing that. Politics and economics are as much divorced as politics and art; so that the much talked-of, but still grand *political* spectacle of the building of the Parthenon and the Propylaea is almost passed over by Professor Adcock, for fear presumably of trespassing on others' ground. Another result is that, with the exception of one or two pages by Dr. Cary (which, short as they are, yet show the advantage of one man dealing with both aspects of history), the whole history of the fourth century is told without any reference to economic conditions—this in a work published at Cambridge in 1927. But so it is with a multiple book: either no attempt is made to give a general conspectus of one aspect of the subject (as here with the sources), or an attempt is made, but inadequately and in isolation; while, as often, we miss that summing-up of the meaning and importance of an epoch (for example, of the Athenian empire), because presumably it is no one's business in particular.

There is a fault in arrangement, in that the whole of Attic drama, and therefore Euripides and Aristophanes, are discussed before the Peloponnesian War. There are difficulties either way: but they are here emphasised by the chapter on Sicily from 478 B.C., which is inserted between the two. Again in the sixth chapter of Vol. VI. ('Egypt to the Coming of Alexander') there is much repetition from Vol. V. and from

the first chapter of VI. Some was doubtless inevitable, though there was no need to tell again the story of Evagoras' war with Persia, which anyhow had little effect on Egypt. Chapters I. and V. could with advantage have been amalgamated.

But since this is a work conscientiously done by good scholars, every chapter is interesting to read, and raises questions of which I should like to discuss all, but must content myself with a few. I do not believe that Lampsacus, Myus and Ephesus were from the beginning outside the Delian League. That the Persian king 'gave' the two former to Themistocles proves nothing but that he claimed them (Themistocles lived at Magnesia); to argue that Ephesus was outside because Themistocles landed there on his flight to Persia is to suppose that by c. 472 the League was a highly organised, efficient, centralised Athenian empire, with garrisons in every city, or a union of cities so devoted to Athens that all would be on the watch night and day for a fugitive from Athenian justice. Ephesus was then a free ally of Athens. Nor is it probable that, at a later date, 'no other form of constitution than the democratic was tolerated by Athens in her Empire' (p. 60; cf. pp. 471-2). Certain opportunities to impose suitable governments were taken; that is all we know. The empire was nothing like so efficient as Mr. Walker supposes, for good or evil.

'It was left to a later generation, with its love of antithesis, to exaggerate this contrast between the two statesmen (Cimon and Pericles) until it presents us with the Booby Cimon.' On the contrary, as Mr. Walker has shown on the previous page, it was Stesimbrotus (hostile presumably because of Cimon's conquest of Thasos) who is responsible for that story. Mr. Walker is fond of correcting this 'later generation': to them 'it seemed a thing incredible that he (Pericles) could ever have been anything but the leader of the party to which he belonged. . . . If anything is certain, it is that Ephialtes was the leader of the party down to his assassination, and that Pericles was his subordinate.' The latter 'was merely

the head of the Alcmaeonid house.' But it is to the later generation (Aristotle and the authorities of Plutarch's *Cimon*) that we owe this 'certainty' about Ephialtes. Pericles, by the way, was not an Alcmaeonid, and never head of that house.

'Such charges of corruption (as that against Cimon) . . . serve to illustrate the low level of probity in ancient democracies,' says Mr. Walker—a facile generalisation that explains nothing. How much greater insight is shown by Professor Adcock's 'the lively, critical, ungenerous spirit of the everyday Athenian.' (And only in democracies? Not in Sparta?)

It is wrong to take the Erechtheid casualty-list as typical of the losses of the whole army in that year, and to suppose therefore that it lends some support to the exaggerations of 'Aθ. Πολ. 26, 1. It was not, as far as we know, one of ten similar lists for all the phylae, for none of the other casualty-lists is in this form; it is unique—hence its proud beginning.

Not all important commercial suits of the empire were tried in Athens (p. 94), as the treaty with Phaselis shows; and it should have been pointed out that by these commercial treaties Athens must have conferred very great material benefit on the cities of the League, for, in the Greek world generally, without such special treaties there were no means by which commercial suits between members of different states could be settled, or even brought. The generalisations of Pseudo-Xenophon must not be taken too seriously.

'Although any Athenian citizen was at liberty to bring forward a motion for a new law, or for the amendment of an old one, the proposer was liable to be prosecuted on the ground that the proposed enactment was inconsistent with the law, or contrary to the public interest. Even if the proposal became law, its author was still liable to prosecution under the *Graphê Paranómōn* until the expiration of a year from the passing of the measure' (p. 100).

This obscures the facts: unless a decree passed the ecclesia, or a new law both the ecclesia and the *nomothetai* (that is, unless it became law), it

could not be indicted; and if it was indicted, it remained in abeyance till the acquittal of its author. Secondly, the prosecutor had to prove that unconstitutional procedure had been followed, or that the law was inconsistent with some law other than that which it was proposed to amend, or with the general body of law (e.g., with the democratic constitution)—obviously an indispensable provision, however much it may have been abused in practice. The significance of this *Graphê Paranómōn*, as of other details of the Athenian constitution (particularly the political importance of the dicasteries), is not clearly brought out; nor the important fact that in Greece the principle that all citizens should take some part in government and not delegate their functions, that there should be no strong and permanent executive, was common to democracy and oligarchy alike, to Aristotle and to Pericles, to Cleon and to the framers of the oligarchic reforms of 411.

The power of Persia after Cnidus and the peace of Antalcidas is exaggerated by both Mr. Tarn and Dr. Cary. To say that by Cnidus 'the Persian navy became undisputed master of the Aegean Sea,' and that by the peace the Greeks recognised this mastery (it 'made Persia the arbiter of Greece'), is, in spite of Isocrates, very misleading. Not only was the Persian fleet manned and commanded by Greeks, but the whole initiative had been Conon's; and after 394 the Athenians made free use of the Dardanelles until dispossessed, not by Persia, but by Sparta. As for the autonomy of the Greek states, the principal clause of the peace (which 'gave Persia the right of perpetual interference'), Sparta, the enemy of Persia, simply ignored it; so did Athens nine years later. Persia's mastery was a fiction; she could make no use of her temporary advantage; she relied, for one thing, too much on Greek mercenaries; and her statesmanship, like the Greek, was bankrupt—hence the rise of Macedon.

I do not understand how the second Athenian League can be described as a 'practical instrument of government,' when 'no regulations were drawn up for

the delicate task of assessing the military and financial liabilities of its members; and no machinery was provided for removing a deadlock between the two branches of Congress; nor for preventing the secession of any of its members. In fact, it was only an alliance, which lasted just so long as a few of its principal members desired, and not an instrument of government at all. The first League was, or rather was developing into one, and into the only practical means of uniting Greece without foreign domination, when it was destroyed by the Peloponnesians.

Professor Bury gives great praise to Dionysius, 'the ablest and most important Greek statesman between Pericles of Athens and Philip of Macedon.' Yet he accomplished nothing that was permanent, and only his military tactics are interesting. Too much space is given to military operations throughout these volumes, and far too much in this chapter, with its repellent accounts of massacres of Carthaginians by Greeks, and of Greeks by Carthaginians. It is a relief to get back from this efficient brutality to the comparative humanity, the inefficiency, and the intellectual curiosity of Athens.

The narrative of Philip's reign, by Mr. Pickard-Cambridge, is a bald one, not much more than a careful account of unilluminated events; and for these events he relies too much on the statements of Demosthenes, while not using him enough for all the incidental light he throws on the times: for example, the speeches against Timotheus and against Polyces are alone sufficient to disprove the facile theory of Athenian refusal to serve in person in the fourth century, and their constant reliance on mercenaries; and, in addition, go far towards explaining the war-weariness of Athens in the forties—they had served on so many ineffectual, scattered, apparently purposeless campaigns in the preceding twenty years. Nor is the position of the 'mercenary captains' (and the difference between men like Charidemus and Chabrias or Chares) made clear, a matter of great importance, nor the true significance of the war between Athens and Philip. It was not simply a struggle between the

small city-state and an all-embracing united kingdom—a struggle in which 'to modern readers . . . it may be clear that the ideal of Demosthenes and Athens was a narrow one; that it was in the interests of humanity that it should be superseded by wider political and ethical conceptions.' It was a war also between highly developed states with free institutions and a primitive country under a crude autocracy, that is, to Demosthenes, between civilisation and barbarism, and when we read of Philip's traditional method of securing the throne, shall we say that Demosthenes was wrong? Yet Mr. Pickard-Cambridge can defend Aeschines' conduct at Delphi in 340. If there is any single incident in Greek history which would justify an invader, however barbarous, in crushing the last remnants of Greek autonomy, it is this Amphiscean War; Aeschines was not, indeed, solely responsible; but he was at home in it, and never conscious of his folly, but proud of it. It is he, not Demosthenes, who was typically representative of all that was 'narrow' in the city-state ideal; and if there is nothing in the speeches of Demosthenes to disprove his rehabilitation by modern historians (in which Mr. Pickard-Cambridge cautiously shares), there is everything in his own.

Mr. Tarn has three good, at times eloquent, chapters on Alexander and the Greek world in 335–301; he is specially good in his summing-up of Alexander's career, though more emphasis on its importance for the spread of Christianity to Europe is needed. His account of the parties at Athens after 335 is too schematic (as is Professor Adcock's of those of 431–421)—we know very little about the matter, and what little we can surmise does not suggest well-defined, organised parties. He ought not to have omitted the dramatic story of the debate between Hagnonides and Phocion in the Macedonian camp in 318—a vivid picture of Athens in the depths. The number of recruits received into the ephebate yearly (after the reform) was (probably) 400–450, not 800. Such a discrepancy as that between the figures for the population of Athens in 322 on

pp. 460 and 553 (31,000 and 21,000 respectively) ought at least to have been noted and explained. Mr. Tarn writes of Alexander's 'acts of justice far in advance of his time, like his unheard-of step of ordering Parmenion to put two Macedonians on trial for rape and kill them like animals if convicted'; but even if the story of Paches is a myth (and Professor Adcock is too positive on that point), that of Aeschines and the woman of Olynthus shows that Alexander was only reacting in the ordinary Greek way. The Greeks were rather prudish in such matters.

There are, as before, excellent chapters on art and architecture by Professor Beazley and Mr. Robertson; and the former, especially, brings his into touch with the rest of the book, with politics and philosophy, more than any other of the writers on 'special' subjects. It would be absurd of me to criticise either of these scholars on matters of fact and opinion; but I note with interest that Professor Beazley makes no mention of the Berlin Demeter nor of the Dresden Athena, that he apparently accepts the view that we have a trustworthy copy of Myron's *Athena and Marsyas*, and that he does not emphasise the strength of tradition (as shown in the records of the schools and the preference for simple athletic figures) in Dorian sculpture, particularly in the fourth century. I was particularly glad to read: 'It is better to call the artist (of the Olympia pediments) not Paeonius, but the master of Olympia.' What pages of fruitless writing would have been saved if scholars had from the beginning spoken of the master of the Choiseul-Gouffier or the Cassel Apollo, instead of fastening on to the statues the names of Calamis and Pythagoras, if they had worked as the historians of vase-painting have done. If by chance some external evidence had been found that Pheidias' Lemnia was certainly not bareheaded, the opening chapters of *Meisterwerke* would have looked silly; yet it would not have in the least affected the real value of Furtwängler's work, his analysis of the Dresden statue.

The bibliographies to the several chapters are, mostly, well chosen, but

(except Mr. Robertson's) often ill-arranged, for an alphabetical order of authors is not the best possible for a complex subject. This is specially to be regretted in a work where particular references to authorities are rare. For Chapter I. of Vol. V., Beloch's chapter on population in his *History* is not mentioned, though it modified his views as expressed in *Bevölkerung* and his articles in *Klio*, which are (it is mentioned for Chapters VII.-VIII. and XI.-XII. among a host of miscellaneous articles and books); nor is his chapter on economic conditions, refuting Bücher (who is mentioned); nor any articles on the building inscriptions, though these are referred to in the body of the work; nor Lipsius on the *τίμημα* (which, again, is given for Chapters VIII.-IX. of Vol. VI.). The bibliography to Chapter V. (The Drama) is good, but badly needs classification, and, though Wilhelm's *Urkunden* is given, the didascalia-inscriptions are not mentioned under original sources. For Chapters VIII.-XI. of Vol. VI. Cloché's articles are distributed into different sections, though they belong together; and *C.I.A.* II. 70, Dittenberger, and Hicks and Hill, are quoted, but not *I.G.*<sup>2</sup> (which is given of course often elsewhere, though, again, not for Chapters II.-IV.). It would be very useful if, when the final volume is published, a selected supplementary bibliography of later work were added.

The index is not so satisfactory as it might be—I have noted particularly such entries as *citizenship*, *wages*, *manufacture*, *Theopompus*, *Charinus*. There are hardly any misprints—Diodorus for Diodotus (p. 160), Plato, *Comicus* (p. 499), are worth noting.

Within the body rather than the soul of the work are two essays, on the Drama and on Herodotus and Thucydides, by Dr. Sheppard and Dr. Macan respectively. The former is happily written, with a good allusive style, though hardly for the general. It is particularly good in its treatment of Aristophanes, though I doubt the 'happy country life' he led before the war—he belonged, like Cleon, to Kydathene, and was altogether at home in Athens; and his ability, when he liked, as a creator



of character like Philocleon, is not brought out. The end of the *Oresteia* is treated very summarily, and the reader gets a better idea of the greatness of Aeschylus from Professor Beazley than from Dr. Sheppard. Dr. Macan's essay is of great interest to the historian. What is to be made of such a sentence as '*Above all* (my italics), the world of Thucydides is a world of men: gods and women are conspicuous only by their absence'? (So Professor Bury in the previous chapter: 'The two most important things we know about him are . . . that he would not have the gods and would not have women at any price in history. They both represented the irrational, and this was the age of reason.') If he ignored Aspasia and 'the scandals and tittle-tattle against Pericles current at the outbreak of the war,' so did he Anaxagoras and Pheidias and the scandal about them. If he says little about religious forces, he says nothing about the 'enlightenment'—Gorgias (though he had his opportunity), Protagoras, Socrates, Euripides, even Antiphon till he became an active politician. So does Dr. Macan surmise that 'as a loyal Periclean,' he had 'no use for Solon,' as for gods and women. Was Thucydides a gossip that he wrote down everything that came into his head? Worse: Dr. Macan repeats his view of Thucydides' 'ludicrous depreciation of the historical importance of the Persian wars.' This is to misunderstand completely not only Thucydides' attitude towards war, but that of Herodotus and the Greeks generally—a misunderstanding perhaps natural be-

fore 1914, but unexpected now. Finally, he insists that Thucydides was 'not quite impartial' (which is true enough)—witness his animosity against Cleon, his unstinted admiration of Pericles, and his praise of the revolutionaries of 411; but when he adds 'all this may not amount to very much, but it amounts to something, and incidentally helps to redeem the historical artist from the fate of the bare annalist,' one can only wonder that anyone can take Thucydides as an example to support the vulgar notion that impartiality and artistic skill are not to be found together in a historian. Are the descriptions of the plague, of the *stasis* at Corcyra, of the Sicilian expedition itself, the less readable for being impartial? For that matter, is the narrative of the revolution of 411 the less impartial for all his admiration of its authors? It is the artist, more than anyone, who must never take sides.

However, as I take leave of this work, I am more conscious of its merits than of its demerits. It might in many ways have been better, in arrangement, in the treatment of some of its main themes, and in detail. When one thinks of a book like Beloch's *Greek History* and reflects what one man can do on much the same scale as the writers of this book, and how great is the gain in unity of treatment, one cannot help regretting that no one has appeared to do as much in English. Yet, as a whole, the book is authoritative, and, as we have nothing else like it, will long be the standard work, especially these last two volumes, for the history of Greece.

A. W. GOMME.

#### GREEK ORATORY.

ISAEUS. With an English translation by EDWARD SEYMOUR FORSTER. Pp. xvii + 487. London: William Heinemann, Ltd. (The Loeb Classical Library), 1927. 10s. 6d. net.

ESCHINE I., *Contre Timarque: Sur l'Ambassade infidèle*. Texte établi et traduit par VICTOR MARTIN et GUY DE BUDÉ. Paris: Société d'Édition *Les Belles Lettres*, 1927.

ISOCRATES, *de Pace* and *Philippus*. Ed. with a Historical Introduction and Commentary by M. L. W. LAISTNER. Published for Cornell University by Longmans, Green and Co., 1927. \$2.50.

PERHAPS the best thing that can be said about Isaeus is that he was the most businesslike of the orators. He is not one to be read for his style,

which is surpassed by Lysias in purity, by Aeschines in vividness, and by Dinarchus in scurrility. The content of his speeches is not of particular interest except to students of Attic law in a specialised branch, and he conceals his own personality without succeeding in adopting that of the person in whose character he composes a speech. He had, however, in ancient times a reputation for making the best of a bad case, and Professor Forster gives him full credit for his ability in marshalling his arguments to the best advantage, in *suppressio veri*, and in the use of actual untruth.

Mr. Forster is a translator of wide experience, and in the present case he employs a style excellently suited to his author. It is clear, concise, and straightforward, expressing all that is in the Greek without expansion or omission. It is hard even to pick out one or two verbal points over which we might differ; but, e.g., in *Menecles*, § 6, *δευτέρῳ μηνὶ ἢ τρίτῳ* should probably be rendered 'a month or two later' rather than 'in the second or third month.' In the *Dicaeogenes* case the complicated story is made much easier to follow by the addition of numbers I., II., and III. after the names *Dicaeogenes* and *Eubulus* which occur in three different generations.

In his treatment of the text the editor is conservative, introducing hardly any changes except the occasional omission of a palpable gloss. In *Cleonimus*, § 10, he obelises the corrupt *ἐσώθη*, but offers no emendation.

The introduction, which occupies only ten pages, is of necessity condensed. It contains a Life, mainly based on the meagre and untrustworthy ancient biographies, a summary of the history of the text, and a useful compendium of the Attic law of inheritance.

The *Aeschines* of Martin and de Budé represents the French counterpart of the English series, to which, except that the volumes are unbound, it is not inferior in form and appearance. For the life of the orator we have to rely almost entirely on the prejudiced statements of Demosthenes and the self-laudation of Aeschines himself, and the editors decide that little can be known

accurately. Their account of the text is based mainly on the work of Heyse, but, chiefly on papyrological grounds, they refuse to accept his classification of the MSS. in families. They have therefore, in their *apparatus criticus*, abandoned the use of collective sigla. They make no radical changes in the text, and where the traditional readings will make sense they have generally kept them, maintaining that perfection of style is not to be expected from a man who picked up his education on the stage. The introduction to the *Timarchus* is brief and to the point; that to the *Legatio*, though actually longer owing to the necessity of painting the historical background, is as concise as it can be. The translation seems to be accurate. In the text, *Φοκίων* is presumably a misprint. The absence of any kind of index is a somewhat serious defect.

Isocrates, if there is any truth in tradition, did not care for lecturing to crowds, and considered two pupils at a time sufficient company. If, then, his influence on his contemporaries was so great as Professor Laistner believes, we must suppose that his speeches, or rather treatises on Politics, were read by a large and intelligent public. In his introduction to the *de Pace* and *Philippus* the editor holds a brief for the importance of Isocrates' influence on practical politics, claiming for the *Panegyricus* the credit of having formulated the constitution of the Second Athenian League. In relation to the Panhellenic union against Persia on which the orator had set his heart, Mr. Laistner observes that Isocrates was alone in realising the full genius of Philip. To this it would be, perhaps, captious to object that Philip's leadership was only the *δευτερος*, or rather *τρίτος πλοῦς* to which the veteran theorist resorted when other appeals had been unsuccessful. Though Mr. Laistner's chief interest is in the historical content of the speeches, he does not neglect linguistic and stylistic details: with the former, his notes deal adequately, while the chapter of the introduction devoted to literary influences on Isocrates and his influence on later writers is interesting though

somewhat conjectural. The *apparatus criticus* is commendably short; in fact

it hardly exists; but it contains all that is needed.  
J. F. DOBSON.

## A BIBLIOGRAPHY OF GREEK LAW.

*A Working Bibliography of Greek Law.*  
By GEORGE M. CALHOUN and  
CATHERINE DELAMERE. Pp. xx + 144.  
(Harvard Series of Legal Bibliographies, I.) Cambridge, U.S.A.:  
Harvard University Press; London:  
H. Milford, 1927. 18s. net.

IN days when the output of books and articles is wellnigh overwhelming, the function of the bibliographer becomes ever more important. We therefore welcome the proposed Harvard Series of Legal Bibliographies, designed, in the Editor's words, 'to provide for the scholar a survey of sources and literature as comprehensive and complete as possible.' Of this project the firstfruits lie before us in the present volume, which contains a list of some 1,750 works, exclusive of articles in Pauly-Wissowa and Daremberg-Saglio, selected by Professor Calhoun, well known for his numerous contributions to the study of Greek Law, and arranged by Miss Delamere.

The modesty of Professor Calhoun's preface almost disarms criticism. Yet candour compels the recognition of several flaws detracting seriously from the value of the work. The period covered by the collection is nowhere clearly indicated: the title-page bears the date 1927, but the author's preface is dated March, 1925, and thus recent works like Ehrenberg's *Neugründer des Staates* (1925) and the monumental second volume of Busolt's *Griechische Staatskunde* (1926) will not be found in it. Further, there is no attempt at classification, but all the titles are

arranged in a single alphabetical list under authors' names. This system has been adopted, we are told, 'in order to avoid the elaborate cross-referencing which would greatly increase the bulk of the volume and expense of publication': yet the utility of the work would be enhanced out of all proportion to its increase of bulk either by some classification or by an index which included many, even though it did not comprise all, of the topics treated.

The selection of works also raises numerous questions, especially in view of the authors' claim that 'the general principle in case of doubt has been to include rather than reject.' Why, for example, is Cicotti's inquiry into the number of Attic slaves included and Miss Sargent's recent discussion omitted? Why are Sestier's and Stein's works on piracy and Lécrivain's article in Daremberg-Saglio admitted, while Ormerod's valuable book and Kroll's article in Pauly-Wissowa on 'Seeraub' are excluded? Why is Foucart's article on *Στρατηγὸς ὑπάρως* cited and Holleaux's indispensable book passed over? Why are even standard works like Freeman's *Federal Government*, Warde Fowler's *City State*, and Braunstein's *Politische Wirksamkeit der griechischen Frau* denied a place? But we need not multiply such queries. A valuable foundation has been laid by the labour and enthusiasm of the authors, and we hope that soon a second edition will enable them to complete the edifice.

M. N. TOD.

## THE ARGONAUTICA.

*The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius.*  
Book III. Edited with Introduction  
and Commentary by M. M. GILLIES.  
Pp. xlviii + 160. Cambridge: Uni-  
versity Press, 1928. 15s. net.

As Mr. Gillies remarks, the *Argonautica* is too often merely a happy hunting-ground for tantalising Unseens. The present edition is therefore welcome as

an attempt to make Apollonius Rhodius more accessible to English students, and one may remark in passing that it is gratifying to reflect that the best edition of Apollonius is an English one, or rather an Irish one emanating from Dublin. The only way of inducing readers to form their own estimate of the *Argonautica* is to put before them

a portion of it, for it is questionable whether those whose time for reading classical authors is limited could properly be advised to read the whole of a work roughly half the length of the *Odyssey*. Mr. Gillies has therefore done wisely in editing Book III. only, the story of Medea, though this particular section of the poem in point of fact does not end until after the 200th line of Book IV. Unquestionably the story of the loves of Medea and Jason is the finest portion of the poem, the most interesting to modern readers, though not the most typical, for readers who turn from Book III. to Book I. or Book II. will be sadly disappointed by this 'pedant turned poet.'

Mr. Gillies' edition will certainly not supersede that of Mr. Mooney. As he candidly confesses his debt to his predecessors there is no need to lay stress on the fact that there is nothing strikingly new in either the annotations or the interpretations of doubtful points. The introduction is lengthy, and will be very useful to those readers who are not specialists in the period. It supplies a background, and it is that which is lacking to most of those who are attracted to Apollonius, possibly from the knowledge that he had preceded Vergil in introducing a love motive into an epic. It is an attempt to dispel 'the mist which for centuries has shrouded the literature of Alexandria.' Mr. Gillies aptly says that to some students Alexandrian literature is the child of the Golden Age of Hellas, to others the parent of Roman literature. He himself would claim for it a right to an independent existence.

Of Apollonius himself we know but little. Till recently he was held to be the successor of Eratosthenes. Recent discoveries have made it clear that

Apollonius succeeded Zenodotus and was himself succeeded by Eratosthenes. Callimachus was never chief librarian at Alexandria, was not senior to Apollonius, and therefore all the explanations of the quarrel between Apollonius and Callimachus, as arising from the contemptuous attitude of a disgruntled senior towards a rising and presumptuous junior, may go into the waste-paper basket. Mr. Gillies holds that the scholars of Alexandria (headed by Callimachus) were angered at the 'fumbling efforts of a raw youth' in a 'new and dangerous medium,' and were derisive of his attempt to fuse together Homer and the glamour of Romance. Technically, perhaps—though here Mr. Gillies is merely speculating—critics of the day were offended by the 'crude immaturity of a youthful experiment,' actually 'by the adaptation of the epic to Romance.'

As the present reviewer has said elsewhere, 'the praise of Apollonius ends usually in eulogy of Homer and Vergil.' Despite this latest editor it will still be so. Mr. Gillies has not ventured to edit all the *Argonautica*, and when he speaks of the 'exile' of the poem 'from its proper place among the masterpieces of ancient Greek literature,' he speaks of a portion specially selected for his own purposes. The 'blatant pedantry' of occasional passages is unfortunately a tolerably common phenomenon, and blatant pedantry and the poetic afflatus are the deadliest of enemies. We hope, however, that this new edition will lead a greater number of students to give some attention to a writer who, even if he is a satellite of two larger systems of poetry, will always have an interest of his own.

J. H. E. CREES.

#### THE NEW TEXT OF PLUTARCH'S LIVES.

*Plutarchi Vitae Parallelae*. Recognoverunt CL. LINDSKOG et K. ZIEGLER. Vol. III., fasc. II., recensuit K. ZIEGLER. Leipzig: Teubner, 1926. Cloth, M. 10 (paper, M. 8.40).

THE fourth instalment of the new Teubner text of Plutarch's *Lives*, the

first since 1915, contains the *Lives* of Lycurgus and Numa, Lysander and Sulla, Agesilaus and Pompey. A passage of the preface promises well:

Largius etiam quam in priore fasciculo viro-  
rum doctorum coniecturas . . . commemoravi.  
Hoc ideo feci, quod sescenties commenta vetus-



tiorum, Reiskii praesertim, cum in editionibus posterioribus non commemorata essent, iterum atque iterum a viris doctis recentiorum temporum denuo excogitari et proferri vidi, quod et ipse persaepe expertus sum.

Good. But even more of the kind should have been quoted; more even of H. Richards—e.g. his ταὐτὸ for τοῦτο at *Pomp.* 1. 1, ἐπιτρεφόμενων at *Lyc.* 8. 2, and μενεῖν for μένειν (this text has μενεῖν) at *Lyc.* 13. 2. Richards anticipated the editor's 'num χρήσθαι?' at *Lyc.* 29. 9, as Cobet anticipated 'πλούτοις Zie.' at *Pomp.* 64. 1.

Some bold conjectures are put in the text—e.g. Latte's λεχούς for τῶν ἱερῶν at *Lyc.* 27. 3, and his βασιλίζειν (which I too had conjectured) for βασιλεύεσθαι at *Sull.* 12. 1. But why is Amyot's Μάριον still allowed to oust Οὐάριον at *Sull.* 6. 22? In a context that says much of Marius, Μάριον would not be so corrupted; τοὺς περὶ Οὐάριον φυγάδας must be right, referring to the exiles under the *lex Varia de maiestate*, among whom was Varius himself.

*Pomp.* 48. 1 is left in a sorry plight. The editor records, without accepting, Cobet's deletion of τῷ ὑπάτῳ, which is

superfluous and out of place: but Cobet strangely spared τοῦ Βύβλου, which should be immediately after τις if anywhere; and, until ἐκ κεφαλῆς can be better defended than it was by Reiske, κατὰ κεφαλῆς should be read here as in *Marcell.* 16. 1, where it was proposed by Reiske himself.

Here and there a patent blunder of the manuscripts is left without remedy or remark. At *Sulla* 4. 2 we read that Sulla, as military tribune, induced 'the great and numerous tribe of the Marsi' to become friends and allies of Rome. The Marsi of Italy had long been such, and they remained such until the Social War. What to substitute for Μαρσούς I know not; probably some Gaulish tribe (which may also have given the epithet *Martius* to Narbo): but the reader should be warned that Holden's long note is beside the point.

But, when all is said, the new text of the *Lives* is a godsend, especially since the Loeb editor's text is as faulty as his translation, which, at its worst, can give us 'from the very altars' for ἐπὶ ταῖς ἀραις (*Aristid.* 25. 1).

E. HARRISON.

### SOME QUESTIONS OF MUSICAL THEORY.

*Some Questions of Musical Theory: Chapter III., The Second String; Chapter IV., Ptolemy's Tetrachords.* By WILFRED PERRETT, B.A., Ph.D. Pp. 31-97. Cambridge: W. Heffer and Sons, Ltd. 1928. 5s. net.

THE first two chapters of this work were published in 1926 (*cf. C.R.*, XL., 218). The third chapter is devoted to a determination of the size of the enharmonic intervals used by the Greeks. The fourth chapter analyses the evaluations of chromatic and diatonic tetrachords preserved by Ptolemy (*Harmonica* II. 14). Even if the material were presented in a less inconsequential fashion than that which Mr. Perrett favours, students of Greek music would not derive much positive information or any coherent theory from this book; for the author's interest in the subject is incidental to his advocacy of "septimal harmony," his gibes

at Helmholtz, and his scorn of Western music and tunings.

Mr. Perrett's main postulate, that the seventh harmonic found a place in Greek music, is a reasonable one; and he has no difficulty in showing that it plays a part in some of the tetrachords of Ptolemy. But this is all *vieux jeu* to readers of the great geographer's pages; what we should like to know is the exact relation between Ptolemy's ratios and the great discovery of Olympos which formed the main theme of Chapters I. and II. Mr. Perrett does not tell us. Instead, he shows that some of the tetrachords are identical with sections of his own theoretical 'tablature,' published in Chapter I.—and some are not; conversely, some possible tetrachords in the 'tablature' are not to be found in Ptolemy. The author draws no conclusions from these facts, but is tempted in one case to

suggest a modification of Ptolemy's ratios.

This is not the first attempt to explain and illustrate Greek music, or some features of it, by a theoretical scale constructed on mathematical principles. Mr. Perrett does not force the ancient evidence as much as some of his predecessors; he leaves it out of account. The passage of Plutarch, for example, from which the whole discussion arose (*De Mus.*, 1134 f.), is not fully quoted or discussed. The *συντονώτερος σπονδειασμός*, which is one of the greatest difficulties of the passage, is not even mentioned; nor is the *ἐκβολή* which Aristides Quintilianus notices in connexion with the *σπονδειασμός*. The

enharmonic scales given by Ar. Quint. (pp. 19-21 M.) are ignored. The evidence drawn from the musical notation is highly selective, and presupposes that Greif's theories (*Rev. des Et. Gr.*, 1910-1914) are wrong. The theory that the pure enharmonic of Olympus lasted only from 650 B.C. to 600 B.C. needs to be considered in relation to Aristotle *Pol.* VIII. (V). 1340 a.

But perhaps Mr. Perrett has not finished his discussion of the subject, and will have some corrections to make in these chapters, just as this book has afforded him an opportunity of revising a number of errors in the first two chapters.

J. F. MOUNTFORD.

#### LATER GREEK RELIGION.

*Later Greek Religion.* By EDWYN BEVAN. Pp. xl+234. London and Toronto: J. M. Dent and Sons, Ltd. 5s. net.

THIS volume of extracts printed in translation is a worthy sequel to Mr. F. M. Cornford's *Greek Religious Thought from Homer to the Age of Alexander*. The task of illustrating in so small a compass the religious development of the six succeeding centuries is formidable, and no two students would make identical selections: what is here offered satisfies most reasonable requirements. It is easy to say what one would like to see added (for instance, the Epicurean *τετραφάρμακος*; the Delian aretology of Isis, *I.G.* XI. 4, 1299; the Oxyrhynchus Litany of Isis, *P. Oxy.* 1380; the Imouthes papyrus, *P. Oxy.* 1381, which illustrates so well the background of Hermetic literature; a text in praise of Mandulis, Preisigke, *Sammelbuch*, 4127, to which I hope to return elsewhere; some of the Orphic hymns; the Philadelphian inscription discussed in *C.R.* 1924, 58 f.), but it is extremely difficult

to see what should have been deleted to make room, and Dr. Bevan has no doubt considered and rejected these claimants for admission. If any general criticism is to be made of the anthology, it is that the cruder side of popular religion deserves a little more space; one or two excerpts from the magical papyri would be useful.

The translations given are for the most part Dr. Bevan's, and suitable;<sup>1</sup> the introduction has that distinction which we expect from him, a singular freshness of contact with the ancients and power of letting them speak for themselves. It is no small feat to command the modern literature relating to the subject and at the same time to see it unclouded by bibliography. *Later Greek Religion* should have a wide circulation.

A. D. NOCK.

<sup>1</sup> On p. 60 *pull peoples down* for *καταλύει δῆμον* should probably be changed to *are subversive of democracy*; on p. 71 J. G. Milne's view of the 'couch of Serapis' (*Journ. Eg. Arch.*, XI. 6 ff.) deserves consideration.

#### THE LOEB HORACE.

*Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica.* By H. R. FAIRCLOUGH. (Loeb Series.) Pp. xxx+509. London: Heinemann. 10s. net.

A NEW Loeb is always a useful addition to our shelves: a new Horace still more

so: and it is appropriate that the work should be that of Professor H. R. Fairclough, who edited Virgil in the Loeb series. There was at one time (happily now past?) a tendency to depreciate Horace unduly as a poet, a movement

bravely resisted and—one hopes—successfully stemmed by such valuable recent contributions to literary aesthetic as that of Professor A. Y. Campbell's *Horace*. After all, when all is said and done, who has ever succeeded in imitating—still more, in parodying—Horace at any time? *Pindarum quisquis*. . . . He remains inimitable, inaccessible. *Nos nequiores*. Only Kipling, perhaps, of the moderns, secures a *proxime accessit*. Professor Fairclough, therefore, has the unenviable but distinguished task of trying to preserve some of the magic of Virgilian and Horatian lines for modern ears.

And it may as well be frankly admitted at once that he has succeeded so far as any modern can hope to succeed. Scholars will continue to disagree, where taste is concerned, as to the exact interpretation and correct reading of certain Horatian passages. Professor Fairclough anticipates this variance of opinion by recording with faithfulness the various readings of disputed passages, and by a slightly fuller annotation than is usual in this series. The result is something approaching a new edition in the light of recent scholarship—an edition which has had the benefit of the ripe experience of Dr. T. E. Page.

Horace, more than any other writer, requires for a true interpretation the qualities of proportion, sanity, and humour (all much the same thing) in his editor, and there is ample evidence of their presence in this edition. *Ep.* I. i. 92: 'He hires a boat and gets just as sick as the rich man who sails in his private yacht'; and *Ep.* I. i. 108: 'Above all, sound, save when troubled by the "flu"'—though here the wit of the line surely does not depend on the use of slang. Similarly, in *Ep.* I. xi. 29 the rendering of 'quadrigis' by 'cars' surely introduces modern and undesirable ideas. In points of detail, *Sat.* I. ii. 64, the note on Fausta reads: 'Fausta's name indicates her noble origin.' Is there not also a reference to the 'omen' contained in the 'nomen'—'hoc miser uno nomine deceptus'? *Ep.* I. i. 32: 'Est quadam prodire tenus . . .' Does *est* mean 'It is worth

while' and not rather 'It is possible'? *Ep.* I. i. 79: 'Quos in vivaria mittant,' 'to stock their preserves.' Is this the last word? *Ep.* I. ii. 2: 'Praeneste relegi'; can this mean, 'I have been reading afresh at Praeneste'? *Ep.* I. ii. 19: 'Providus,' 'with discerning eyes.' Is it not rather 'With thoughts of home'? *Ep.* I. ii. 56: 'Rebus' is surely Causal Ablative. *Ep.* I. iii. 8: 'Diffundit' calls for a note. *Ep.* I. iv. 8: 'Though it may be heresy to say so, could 'dulci alumno' after all be an Ablative of Comparison? *Ep.* I. vi. 54: 'If churlish' hardly translates 'importunus.' *Ep.* I. vii. 48: 'Nimium distare' surely means 'somewhat far,' not 'too far.' In *Ep.* I. ix. 12 there should be a comma, not a full-stop, after 'pudorem.' *Ep.* I. xiv. 17: 'Non eadem miramur'; not 'our tastes are not the same,' but 'our ideals are not the same.' *Ep.* I. xiv. 29: 'Pigro' is rightly translated 'when you are dead tired.' One is 'tired' rather than 'bored' after a hard day's work. But in *Ep.* I. xiv. 43 'piger' does mean 'bored.' The bored horse (in his folly) envies the ox and wishes to plough. Hence the comma, for this and rhythmical reasons, rightly comes after 'bos.' *Ep.* I. xv. 21: 'Quod me Lucanae iuuenem commendat amicae'; hardly 'give me the grace of youth,' but 'lend me the illusion of youth.' *Ep.* I. xv. 32: 'Donabat' is obviously right. *Ep.* I. xvi. 5: 'Anyone who has worried over this line will feel that 'si,' not 'ni,' is the true reading; and though it is not given in the text, the footnote makes ample amends. *Ep.* I. xvi. 22: 'Sub' does not mean 'forward,' but 'right up to.' Otherwise the point is lost. *Ep.* I. xvi. 20: 'Can be' should be deleted in the translation. *Ep.* I. xvi. 24 might be more pithily expressed. I have confined myself chiefly to *Epistles*. Book I., in the interests of brevity. The chief interest of this book is that almost every Epistle ends with a slight 'surprise,' anticipating thus early the epigram of Martial.

The edition is a worthy acquisition to the Loeb series of translations, and will be welcomed by all lovers of Horace.

W. W. GRUNDY.

## CATULLUS AND HORACE.

*Catullus and Horace.* Two poets in their environment. By TENNEY FRANK, Professor of Latin in Johns Hopkins University. Pp. 291. Basil Blackwell, Oxford, and Henry Holt and Co., New York, 1928. 10s. 6d. and 5 dollars.

*The Rome of Horace.* By JEAN ROSE INGERSOLL. Pp. 57 + 103. Colorado Springs: Colorado College Publications (General Series No. 147), 1927.

PROFESSOR TENNEY FRANK has produced a companion volume to his biography of Virgil. It is fresh and original in its outlook, vigorously, if not always elegantly, written, and on the whole sane in its judgments; it is moreover the work of a historian well qualified to place his poets in their social and political setting. But the critic who essays to write their biography on the scale of the present volume has to rely to a very large extent on circumstantial—often dangerously circumstantial—evidence, and he may be well contented if he escape the accusation of making bricks without straw. Professor Frank is not blind to the peril and again qualifies his suggestions with the warning that he does not claim any certainty for his conclusions. On the other hand, his general tone is marked by an easy and engaging confidence, which makes the book a dangerous guide for any one who ventures to read it without continuous reference to the originals and their commentators. This precaution taken, the book contains much that is valuable and suggestive, while his general presentation of the two poets and their poetry is vivid, sympathetic, and sensible.

The most striking feature of the chapters dealing with Catullus is the admirable reconstruction of the life of the society in which he moved when he was Clodia's lover; it is most ingenious and rests on evidence which, if highly circumstantial, is neither far-fetched nor negligible; it is supported by an interesting topographical note (p. 281). There is also an interesting attempt to solve the desperate riddle of the sixty-eighth poem which deserves careful consideration (pp. 43 ff.).

In the portion devoted to Horace may be noted the suggestion that the sixteenth ode of the Third Book gives us Horace's commentary on his refusal to comply with the demand of Augustus that he should serve him as his secretary (p. 210 ff.), and also a fresh apportionment of the stanzas of the *Carmen Saeculare* among the singers, the basis of the division being that stanzas or parts of stanzas containing weak caesuras should be assigned to the girls, while those where the caesura is regularly masculine are allotted to the boys—a fanciful theory perhaps, but worked out with much ingenuity (pp. 253 ff.). Professor Frank is rash in saying of the opening stanza of the seventeenth ode of the Third Book, that Horace 'concocts' a genealogy for Lamia as 'preposterous as one that would derive John Brown from King John' (p. 221). Ancestor-hunting was a fashionable pastime, and such a genealogy is not a whit more preposterous than those adopted by many a Roman family; nor is there anything to show that Horace 'concocted' it. It is also a far too sweeping statement to assert that the 'sketch of early Roman literature' in the first epistle of the Second Book 'is wholly incorrect.' But the analysis and criticism of the literary epistles is sound and stimulating.

Far less satisfactory is his interpretation of the history of Roman literature during the period with which he is concerned; a weakness due in no small degree to an inadequate understanding of the ideals of Hellenistic poetry. He is too ready to use the epithet Alexandrian as a term of censure, forgetful of the fact that Alexandrianism found its most perfect and authentic development at Rome in the poems of Virgil, and somewhat blind to the beauty and importance of the *Marriage of Peleus and Thetis*, in which Catullus brought a new music and a new colour into Latin poetry. He contrasts the 'natural, plain, sincere style' with 'elaborate and ornate Alexandrianism,' and tells us that Horace more than anyone else 'decided which of these two paths Roman literature should take' (p. 132).



The trouble is that it did not take it. Whether the style of the *Odes* of Horace is 'simple, natural, sincere' is debatable in the extreme, while the implication that post-Horatian poetry possessed these characteristics is obviously inadmissible. The influence of Alexandria persists in the later poets, blent with the still stronger and far more destructive influence of the schools of rhetoric. This last factor in the history of Roman style is also implicitly ignored by Professor Frank. He attributes the destruction of the periodic style of Cicero to the influence of Calvus (p. 30). The reasons for the dethronement of Cicero were many, and some of the most important have been well stated by Tacitus and Quintilian. But the new rhetoric that took its place, after helping to undermine it, was not that of

Calvus. The elder Seneca makes it clear that even in the Augustan Age the perverted rhetoric that is such a prominent feature in the Silver Age was already fully developed. All that we know of the oratory of Calvus is that it was sane and fashioned after the best models of Greece. It is to be hoped that when this book reaches a second edition, Professor Frank will develop and elucidate his views by expanding the Sixth Chapter (entitled 'Transition') and perhaps by the addition of an Epilogue.

Miss Ingersoll's essay (*The Rome of Horace*) is a compilation in which under a number of headings (e.g., 'Books,' 'Money,' 'Witchcraft,' 'Religion,' etc.) she collects the appropriate references. It has no claim to originality, but has some value as an index.

H. E. BUTLER.

#### TIBULLUS AND OTHERS.

*Albii Tibulli Aliorumque Carminum Libri IV.* Recensuit, praefatus est, appendice critica instruxit F. CALONGHI. Pp. viii+93. (Corpus scriptorum Lat. Paravianum.) Turin: Paravia, 1928. Paper, 11 l.

THIS long-awaited (Bursian, *J.B.*, 1924, 196, p. 2, and *Riv. di Filol.* 45, p. 144) and ultra-conservative edition retains the four-book division and represents a position towards the text midway between Wilhelm's and Postgate's. It restores to the Guelferbytanus (*G*) its capital and to the Eboracensis (*E*) its identity. Apart from the four 'certain' lacunae, gaps are marked only after i. 10. 25 and 50, the sole transposition is the unescapable one in iii. 10, and at two lines only (ii. 4. 38 and iii. 7. 116, *domator*) is corruption noted. The Tibullian authorship of iii. 8-12 is questioned; iii. 13 is given to Sulpicia and 19 and 20 to Tibullus. Excluding punctuation, spelling, and arrangement, the text differs from Postgate's (2nd edition) at over 120 places. In over 80 Calonghi keeps the Ambrosianus (*A*) where Postgate rejects it; in some 10 further cases, while forsaking it, he adheres closer to it; in 12 cases he abandons it where Postgate retains it. In not a few of these instances where he upholds *A* it is almost

certainly wrong—e.g., i. 3. 17, 4. 44, 6. 72, 9. 35—and sometimes, where he deserts it, it may well be right—e.g., ii. 5. 79; iii. 2. 23, 7. 75, 82. He prints two conjectures of his own—i. 6. 42 *det cito terga*, after Cartault, and unconvincingly iii. 4. 26 *ultima* for *illud*. He suggests, but does not print, *vani falsique* at iii. 4. 3 and *nonne erit . . . severis?* at iii. 6. 21. At ii. 3. 61 *dura seges* is in a parenthesis and in apposition to *terra*; at iii. 5. 3 *baiarum* = *fontium*, after Pichard; at i. 2. 72 he thinks perhaps right, but does not print, *insolito* (*A V Ber.*, not recorded by Postgate).

A brief preface maintains generally orthodox views on the sources of the text. *A* may be the parent of the Vaticanus (*V*). The excerpta Parisina (*Par.*) come from the same source as *A*. The fragmentum may have been the remains of a liber Veronensis written before 1329. I do not understand *nihil unquam mutavimus*, p. vii ad f. The critical appendix, printed after the text, is much fuller than Postgate's, giving, for example, the inscriptions of the separate poems as well as books, and distinguishing the readings of the two codices of *Par.* (Ponchont's collations).

Its principal features are first that it reproduces the results of his own

inspection of *A* and *V* (already in *Riv. di Filol.*, 1918-19), and second that it gives prominence to the Berianus (Ber.), a fifteenth-century MS. of which he contributed an account to the *Atti della R. Acc. di Torino* 51 (1915-16) that might with advantage have been summarised in the preface.<sup>1</sup> He sometimes does not quote Ber. where one might have wished. This codex stands clearly in close relationship with *A* and *V*, has considerable merit, and, unless and until something better turns up, will have to be taken into account. It does not, of course, challenge *A*'s supremacy among existing MSS. No reference is made to the Brixianus.

Actually very little new information of value is brought forward, and the minute reports of *V* in particular may seem hardly necessary at this date, and

at any rate out of place in an edition of this nature. On the other hand, some MS. readings are surprisingly excluded. Conjectures are noted adequately, some unlikely ones included, and a half-dozen deserving of mention omitted. Postgate's opinions are very fully, perhaps too fully, recorded, and his (but not Lachmann's) corrections at iii. 7. 142 adopted. Six of Housman's suggestions are registered but none accepted. In one or two cases conjectures are attributed inexactly. The setting-out of the apparatus is often diffuse. An asterisk is placed against errors, sometimes hazardingly, but as a rule only in such extreme cases as to make its use valueless. To say nothing of improbable variants, a large number of certain blunders go unbranded. Neither text nor appendix is free from printing blemishes.

H. STEWART.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Riv. di Filol.*, 1918.

#### SPEECHES IN ROMAN HISTORIANS.

*La Technique des Discours dans Salluste, Tite Live et Tacite. La Matière et la Composition.* Par RAGNAR ULLMANN, Skrifter utgitt av det Norske Videnskaps-Akademi i Oslo. Pp. 251. Oslo: Dybwad, 1927.

STARTING with the proposition that speeches in the three Roman historians are used in order to display the character of the speaker in a form borrowed from the theory and practice of rhetoric, the author proceeds to analyse some 140 speeches in Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Since in political (or deliberative) oratory (under which class the majority of speeches in history naturally come) the *prooemium* and *narratio* (for which a *κατάστασις* is often substituted) are not so marked as in forensic oratory, it is in the *tractatio* of the speeches that the rhetorical form can best be observed. Dr. Ullmann shows that the most marked features of the *tractatio* are to be found in the various *τόποι*—such as *utile*, *dignum*, *necessarium*, etc.—which are treated in turn. Sallust, in his speeches, follows a definite scheme, usually making his characters appeal to *utile*, *honestum*, *possibile*, and *necessarium*, in symmetrical arrangement, but there are signs of

rather more freedom in the plan of some of the later speeches. No such stereotyped form, of course, can be traced in the speeches in Livy and Tacitus. While following a rhetorical scheme, Livy uses it with great variety, and his choice of *τόποι* is determined by the character of the speaker and by the situation. Some may wish that in this excellent analysis of 90 speeches in Livy more space had been devoted to showing how the character of the speakers is in each case displayed. This end might perhaps have been better attained if less emphasis had been put on *dispositio*, and more on Livy's use of *sententiae* and of rhetorical colour. To take one instance, the author shows that in the speech made by Eumenes at Rome (Liv. 37. 53), Livy has followed Polybius closely and has not (as he usually did) worked up the speech into a rhetorical arrangement. Such divergences as there are from Pol. 21, 19-21 are attributed to Livy's patriotism. But this is not the whole truth surely. An examination of the divergences leads this reviewer to suspect that though Livy has not made a new rhetorical *dispositio* of the whole, yet considerations of rhetoric and of

characterisation have influenced him: thus, e.g., (a) in the transition in §19b (called by Ullmann 'maladroite'), Eumenes displays a modesty which does not appear in Polybius, but emphasises Livy's conception of the character (and is in accord with Aristotle *Rhet.* 1418b); (b) the 'great period' of Polybius (c. 21, 2-4) has gone, partly perhaps on account of Livy's patriotism (though may not *δευότατον* mean little more than 'very strange' and not 'affreux'?) but also because Livy has an opportunity for the rhetorical hammer (*pater, ego, fratres mei . . . etc.*); (c) in §28 Livy has altered Polybius into a *sententia* of general application. The author points out how in Livy, and still more in Tacitus, appeal to moral considerations is used for more elevated audiences, while utilitarian arguments are thrown to the 'foule ignorante.' The moral tendency is most marked in the *Annals*, the majority of speeches being pronounced in the Senate. We are shown however in the short speeches in Tacitus a rhetorical arrangement is maintained, and we see that his originality lies less in the form of his composition than in the psychological insight of his matter.

In the course of this study the question of sources is examined often in great detail. For Sallust and Tacitus we are referred usually to Von Carolsfeld and to Fabia. For the first decade of Livy

the author shows the rhetorical form of speeches to be corroborative evidence of their divergence from their sources. In the third decade he follows Soltau against Hesselbarth (in his view of an 'intermediate source' used by Livy, who did not there consult Polybius) and he adds some convincing arguments of his own. For the fourth and fifth decade he usually follows Nissen in his view of both the Polybian and the annalistic parts. But when he supports that view by implying that such speeches in the fourth decade as have no formal arrangement are therefore likely to be following closely their sources, his argument is questionable. For even the speech against the triumph of Cn. Manlius (Liv. 38, 45-46), which he regards as careless in its rhetorical arrangement and as closely following an annalist, could be shown to be deliberately designed to display character in rhetorical form, though it is not arranged according to stereotyped rules of rhetoric. For Livy (I believe) in the fourth decade uses the art of characterisation with the greater felicity when he is less bound by rhetorical formality. But such amateur criticisms are easy to make. It is more important to express gratitude to the author for this scholarly work. He has covered a considerable amount of new ground, and he has added to our knowledge of the rhetorical methods of the three Roman historians.

S. K. JOHNSON.

#### A STUDY OF GREEK DOCUMENTS.

*Die antiken Grundlagen der frühmittelalterlichen Privaturkunde (Grundriss der Geschichtswissenschaft. Ergänzungsband I.).* Von H. STEINACKER. Pp. x+171. Leipzig, Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1927. RM. 10

THIS is a very useful study of the ancient document, the more welcome because it is written from a point of view which is in two respects somewhat novel. Much work has been done on the forms, legal force, and methods of registration of the Greek documents on papyrus—the names of Mitteis, Patsch, v. Woess, and A. Segrè, for example, at once occur to the mind—but such researches have been undertaken mainly by jurists, interested

primarily in the content rather than in the form of the material. Professor Steinacker handles it as a student of diplomatic, and, moreover, approaches the subject from the medieval side. As he remarks, a diplomatic study of the papyri may well yield results different from those obtained by scholars whose main interest is legal; and, in fact, his formal examination of the Ravenna deeds, for example, leads him to a rejection, probably justifiable, of the long-established view, which finds in them evidence for the existence at that date of both the *stipulatio* and the *traditio cartae*. There are in them features which seemed to impose the old theory,

but the result of Steinacker's analysis is to deprive these features of their evidential cogency, since the clauses in question are in fact often omitted. So, too, in dealing with the Greek papyri he arrives at new conclusions on several important points. His discussion of the difficult questions of *ἀναγραφή* and *καταγραφή* is particularly valuable. His theory, which comes nearest to that of Schönbauer, though differing in certain particulars, is likely to meet with opposition in some quarters; but it furnishes at least a reasonable and coherent view of the origin and development of these institutions, and will certainly have to be reckoned with. His account of the *βιβλιοθήκη ἐγκτήσεων* is specially to be commended. In his treatment of the Roman document,

Steinacker decidedly favours the view that its history was similar to, and influenced by, that of the Greek, as against those who would differentiate between them. There can be little doubt that he is right. The other view really goes back to a time before the evidence of the papyri from Egypt was available or at least properly appreciated.

The form of the book is peculiar. A large part of it had been set up before the War, and the many additions and modifications necessitated by the constant appearance of new material are collected in an appendix. This entails considerable inconvenience, but was perhaps unavoidable. No such excuse can be alleged for the absence of an index, which is a serious blot on an otherwise meritorious work. H. I. BELL.

#### SOME CLASS-BOOKS.

*Xenophon, Anabasis III. and IV., partly in the Original and partly in Translation.* By S. A. HANDFORD, M.A. Pp. 127. Oxford: Humphrey Milford, Clarendon Press, 1928. 3s. 6d. THIS is one of a series of Abbreviated Classics whose features are well known and need no description here.

If excellence of production will make the scheme a success, the Oxford Press will do it; moreover, any means of attracting pupils to the study of Greek deserves to be commended. In this edition of parts of the *Κατάβασις* the delightful Introduction by Professor J. A. K. Thomson strikes the appropriate note of enthusiasm which the thirteen illustrations are calculated to maintain.

*The Shorter Iliad* (Books I.-XII.). Selected and arranged by H. H. HARDY, M.A. Pp. xix + 195. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1928. 4s. 6d.

To those who want an abridged Homer it is perhaps enough to say that this book is by the editor of *The Shorter Aeneid* (now in its fifth edition) and is similar in design, only with notes considerably fuller. The text is wisely chosen; in amount (almost 4,000 lines) it is more than half the original, and the omitted passages are summarised

in simple English. A genuine love of Homer inspires the notes, which are unhackneyed, up-to-date, and interesting; they give some apt illustrations from the Old Testament (to mention only one of many sources), and put forward a few novelties of interpretation. The notes do not quite exactly fit the text as printed: those on iv. 122f., 230, vii. 469 should be omitted, as referring to lines not included in *The Shorter Iliad*. On v. 356 'shield' should read 'spear' (*ἔγχος*).

A grammatical Introduction (pp. xi-xix) by Mr. T. G. Wells, also of Cheltenham College, gives an outline of Homeric Forms, Syntax, and (very briefly) Scansion.

*The Pirates and Three Other Latin Plays on Caesar's Life.* By HAROLD MATTINGLY, M.A. Pp. 119. London: Methuen, 1928. 2s. 6d.

These plays in easy colloquial Latin are written round episodes in the life of Caesar from 88 to 49 B.C. The longest, *The Pirates*, has an attractive variety of scenes: I. in the *atrium* of Caesar's house at Rome, II. on the deck of a ship off Pharmacussa, III. in the Pirates' Cave, IV. in the Chief Pirate's garden, V. in the *praetorium* at Ephesus. The book is intended primarily for class



reading, but with the help of the stage directions School Dramatic Societies will be able to give striking performances of this and the other three plays. Young actors will be sure to enjoy the disguise of Caesar (p. 9 ff.) and of the Archipirata (p. 44 f.). The characterisation is admirable throughout; Caesar's *clementia* and *humanitas* are well portrayed, and in Scene III. of *Catilina* Cicero, according to the stage directions, 'must be fussy and conceited, but keen and efficient.' Apt allusions occur on almost every page—e.g., women talk (p. 74) of a new fashion at Rome—*ut mulieres vestem breviorē gerant*. Although the Ciceronian style is the model followed, Mr. Mattingly has taken phrases as well as facts from Suetonius; *abi Morboviam* (spoken to a doctor!) is a neat example. Proverbs and terse idioms are numerous.

A few grammatical notes appear at the foot of the page, while at the end of each play historical explanations of the Scenes are given, followed by notes on details. The historical knowledge to be gained by pupils is, of course, a very strong recommendation of the book. The Vocabulary prints the Latin words in a beautifully clear type. Misprints should be corrected on pp. 24<sup>30</sup>, 44<sup>13</sup>, 61<sup>10</sup>, 69<sup>15</sup>; for *serie* (24<sup>3</sup>) *serio* is preferable.

*Cicero in Asia: Selections from Cicero's Letters and Speeches.* By STANLEY PRICE, M.A. Pp. 159. *Cicero and Antony: Selections from the Philippics and the Letters of Cicero.* By G. TURBERVILLE. Pp. 127. Both from Humphrey Milford, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1928. 1s. 9d. each.

These two excellent and attractive *libelli* tempt one to exclaim: 'O fortunatos nimium, sua si bona norint, discipulos!'

Mr. Price's object is 'to give a clear and interesting picture of Asia Minor in the first century B.C., and to serve as an introduction to Ciceronian prose'; and the result is a charming text-book for those who 'have learnt Latin well for two years or more.' The first two pieces will be found more difficult than the rest, but they may easily be postponed by junior forms. The combina-

tion of *Letters* and *Speeches* in one book is novel, and the selections are well chosen—five extracts from the *Letters*, four from the *Speeches* (*Pro Lege Manilia*, *Pro Murena*, *Pro Flacco*, *Pro Rege Deiotaro*). The thirteen illustrations are fresh and interesting, surpassing even the usual high standard of the Oxford Press; and there are two maps. Mr. Price has done his editorial work well; there are many vivid touches in the Introduction (e.g., the comparison, page 16, of how a Roman thought of Asia Minor in the first century B.C. to an Englishman's view of India after the Seven Years' War), while the Notes and Vocabulary are all that can be desired.

The companion volume is intended 'mainly for the use of students who are working for an examination of matriculation standard'; and it serves to illustrate the history of affairs in Rome immediately after the murder of Julius Caesar. The Selections are from *Phil.* I., II. (the longest extract), IV., and VII., with the addition of three short letters, the first being by Decimus Brutus. Apt illustrations enhance the value of this book also—e.g., p. 32, the *denarius* issued to commemorate Caesar's assassination; p. 41, the wooden strong-box with bronze ornamentation found at Pompeii. The Introduction gives the historical setting of the extracts, and there is a Vocabulary, preceded by an Index of Proper Names.

*Readings from Horace.* (Easier Odes.)

By ALEXANDER DUTHIE, M.A. Pp. 103. *Readings from Caesar.* (The Gallic War, Books I.-III.) By the same Editor. Pp. 95. Both from Harrap, London, 1928. 1s. 6d. each. Horace is admittedly a difficult poet for a beginner in Latin, and this Selection presents thirty of the easier Odes (in bulk practically equivalent to a single complete Book) arranged according to metre—Sapphics (seven poems), Alcaics (ten), Asclepiads of various classes (thirteen). Thus pupils will become familiar with each metre in turn. The Odes are chiefly from Books I.-III., including among the harder poems *Tyrrhena regum*, *Odi profanum*, *Angustam amice*, *Caelo tonan-*

*tem*: from Book IV. Mr. Duthie has rightly taken only three odes. The notes give such help as beginners need with constructions, etc., but are too brief to convey much feeling for poetry or style: on I. iii. 1-8 the editor says: 'Begin with *navis*, and go on to *animae* [*? meae*], then take the three *sic* clauses,' and there are other notes of this type. The word *vulgus* seems to rouse the editor: on l. 32 of II. xiii. (*The Unlucky Tree*) his note runs: 'Apparently there is a Democratic Party among the shades!' A misplaced letter disfigures the first line of II. vi. (p. 17). Three short Appendices deal with Poetical Constructions, Figures of Speech, and Metre (where the editor does not use the convenient Choriambus to explain Asclepiads), followed by an Index of Proper Names and a Vocabulary. There are no illustrations.

The *Readings from Caesar* are edited along the same lines, with Introduction (accompanied by a simplified map of Gaul), Notes, and Vocabulary. The first three books of the *De Bello Gallico* are reduced to half of their original amount by omission only (Mr. Duthie confesses that in one sentence he has supplied the subject), and the omitted passages are very briefly summarised. The book is cheap and well suited for beginners.

*Aspects of Roman Life* By R. C. MARTIN, B.A. Pp. 103. London: Mills and Boon, 1928. 2s. 6d.

This collection of 125 Unseens for Middle and Upper Forms springs from a desire to be rid of hackneyed themes, and to show the similarity of the Roman mind to the mind of to-day. The passages (prose and verse) vary in length from twenty-four Hexameter lines to epigrams of a single Elegiac couplet, and are arranged under fifteen headings, such as Religion and Superstition, the Countryside, Social Life and Customs, Legends, Sport, Love, Wit and Epigram. Virgil and Cicero furnish forty-three of the extracts, and twenty-two other authors the remainder, single passages coming from Aulus Gellius, Petronius, Statius, Tiberianus. The interest and variety of the pieces may be gauged from the following titles:

The Effects of their Situation on Seaside Cities, Seneca's Humane View of the Position of Slaves, A Student's Noisy Lodgings (even including *illum cui vox sua in balineo placet*!), A Savage Barber, The Beauty of the World proves the Divine Will, The Great Artist must have congenial Surroundings, Warning to a 'Thruster' [in hunting]. An Introductory Note (p. 11) gives pointed injunctions on Unseen work.

The book is nicely printed, though not free from misprints: in No. 17 (p. 27, l. 1) read *Ad. hanc to amentiam*, in 27 *atennis*, *atennas* should begin *ant-*, for *proprius* (36) read *propius*, for *affere* (78) *afferre*, for *egregium* (81) *egregium*, for *fumas* (87) *fumus*, for *facim* (121) *faciam*. In No. 83 the punctuation after *vultum* requires revision. Some titles might with profit be slightly fuller—e.g., in No. 87 the addition of a word would explain who is speaking. In No. 85 Caesar is Augustus, and the title should be 'The Praise of Augustus.' Should it not be stated that No. 59 was written by Sulpicius Rufus, although preserved among Cicero's *Letters*?

*Latin Prose Revision.* By B. RENDALL, M.A. Pp. 87. London: Methuen, 1928. 2s.

Here are exercises for revision of simple constructions and vocabulary. The sixty Papers of easy sentences (each containing at least twenty sentences) have occasional words suggested, and rightly so; but it seems needless to give *pila* for 'ball' on pp. 3, 5, and 6, while to suggest a singular *mina* for 'threats' (pp. 4, 16) is a positive error. Ten groups of harder sentences and twenty-six passages for Continuous Prose (chiefly translated from Cicero and Livy) conclude a handy little book.

*Easy Latin for Beginners.* By R. E. and A. E. BURNS. Pp. xii+83. London: Methuen, 1928. 2s. 6d.

This should make the *prima clementia* very easy and attractive for girls even of nine years with only two hours a week to spend on Latin. The authors make it their aim to stimulate interest and conceal difficulties, to concentrate on what is regular, to anticipate errors,

and to make the road as smooth as may be for the young: *parcendum teneris*.

*Junior Latin Tests.* By J. M. MILNE, M.A., D.Litt. Pp. 96. London: Harrap, 1928. Sewed, 1s.

THE book contains 100 easy sentences to be rendered in Latin; fifty Test Papers, each composed of a Latin passage for translation (prose and verse alternately), a section on Grammar

(chiefly from the preceding passage), and a set of ten sentences; and finally twelve passages for continuous composition. All the passages, Latin and English, are of the standard of the Lower Grade Leaving Certificate paper of the Scottish Education Department, but the cheapness and merits of the book will recommend its sale elsewhere than in Scotland.

W. G. WADDELL.

*Black Sparta. Greek Stories.* By NAOMI MITCHISON. Pp. 320. London: Jonathan Cape, 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

THE dozen stories in this volume are of outstanding interest and merit. Mrs. Mitchison has shown long since that she has a rare gift of historical imagination, and fifth-century Greece stirs her more deeply than any other period. Her greatest achievement here is her creation of Pindar's character. She has imagined his brilliant beginnings in 'O Lucky Thessaly!' which is based on the Tenth Pythian, and his sad later years in 'The Heart and the Head,' based on the Fourth, Fifth, Ninth, and Eleventh Pythians, and in 'Take back your Bay-Wreath,' based on the Eighth. In all these she has performed with success the extraordinarily difficult feat of imagining a personality consistent with the indications of the Odes, but going far beyond what the Odes actually express; except Wilamowitz, no professional critic has shown so subtle an appreciation of this great and stupidly despised personality. Her treatment of Plato and Socrates in the 'Chosen-by-Lot,' is much less original: her sympathy is keenest for 'the civilisation which perished' in Beazley's words, 'in the storms of the late fifth century, the long war, and the so-called intellectual awakening.'

It is impossible here to sketch the plots of any of the stories. Of the more elaborate the best are 'The Lamb Misused,' a story of Ithome, and 'The Heart and the Head,' which deals with Cyrene. On the whole the slighter sketches are more successful; two of the most ambitious, 'The Epiphany of Poieessa' and 'Black Sparta' begin well, but falter at the crisis, and end rather lamely.

Mrs. Mitchison makes no concessions to modern prejudices, and her acute sense of the vein of cruelty in ancient civilisation, especially at Sparta, makes her dwell too frequently for some tastes on scenes of horror and blood. In 'The Story of Myrto' she boldly adopts an extreme vulgarity of speech, but this experiment is scarcely successful; there was surely nothing in the speech or thought of a fifth-century hetaira quite fitly expressed by the words 'gentleman friend.'

Each story is introduced by a poem: these are uneven, but contain many passages of singular beauty and power.

D. S. ROBERTSON.

*Zur Geschichte der allegorischen Deutung Homers im Altertum.* By F. WEHRLLI. Pp. 96. Borna-Leipzig: R. Noske, 1928.

THIS doctoral dissertation seeks to trace backwards the course of the allegorical interpretation of Homer. Its four chapters deal successively with Ps.-Plutarch (*De Vita et Poesi Homeri*), Crates of Mallus, Chrysippus, and the pre-Stoic allegories. A few points of interest may be noted. Dr. Wehrli argues (against Karl Reinhardt, to whose *De Graecorum Theologia* he is chiefly indebted) that only a very small part of Ps.-Plutarch is drawn from the source used by Heraclitus the allegorist, and that the latter's source dealt with Homer book by book, not according to the order of treatment which Reinhardt suggested. He criticises effectively the view (favoured by E. Maass, Reinhardt, and Chr. Jensen) that Crates was the main source of the later allegorical collections. There is a careful treatment of Antisthenes, whose position in the history of allegory has so often been misstated. As the author rightly says, the Stoics in their physico-theological interpretations of the poets were not following Antisthenes, but the school of Anaxagoras, just as they were indebted to the Heracliteans in their etymologies. The author's general conclusions are somewhat conventional—e.g. he is content with the old view that allegory began with the grammarians, of whom Theagenes was the most ancient. For a different suggestion see *C.R.*, December, 1927, pp. 214 f.

J. TATE.

*Il Deus ex Machina nella Tragedia Greca.*

By BENJAMINO STUMPO. Pp. 43. Palermo: Edizioni Sandron, 1928. Lire 2.50.

THIS is a modest and pleasantly written inaugural address. Its protest against the common assumption that the *deus ex machina* was invented by Euripides is justified, but its claim that a theophany was a convention inherited from the earliest ritual origins of drama, though familiar, is still disputable. There is a brief but interesting review of divine appearances in extant plays, and a useful distinction is made between appearances which are natural and artistic, since they come in response to a hero's own emotions, memories, and aspirations—that of Heracles, for instance, in the *Trachiniae*—and those which are in a bad sense mechanical. The thesis that tragedy derives from a dithyrambic mystery of Dionysus, lost, sought, and joyfully recovered, pleasantly rubs shoulders

with the amusingly Verrallian suggestion that Athena in the *Ion* is in fact the Pythian priestess masquerading as a goddess.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

*Das Bild des Tyrannen bei Platon.* By G. HEINTZELER. Pp. 124. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1928. RM. 8.

THIS is a dissertation for a doctorate, published in the form in which it was originally submitted by its author, who fell ill on the day after his oral examination and died within a few weeks. The final revision is thus missing; but he would be a severe critic who could not readily pardon the defects which revision would no doubt have removed—the repetitions, for example, which appear in the final summary, and the hiatus between the first part, which deals with the figure of the tyrant as it appears in Greek literature before Plato, and the second and more substantial part, which deals with Plato's description of tyranny.

The sub-title of the little book is *Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der griechischen Staatsethik*; and this indicates its scope and nature. It belongs to philosophy rather than to history; and the author has not attempted any account of the actual and historical nature of Greek *τυραννίς*. In his philosophy he is somewhat formal and scholastic. He collects and analyses some of the references to tyranny in the Greek poets and historians of the fifth century; he collects and analyses the references to the tyrant in the various dialogues of Plato. But he does not explain clearly either the general fund of previous and contemporary ideas on which Plato drew, or the actual development and essence of Plato's own ideas. It is interesting to compare his dissertation, so far as it deals with Plato's sources, with a little book of about the same size, published in 1913 by Dr. Kriegbaum, on 'the origin of the views represented by Calicles in the *Gorgias* of Plato.' Dr. Kriegbaum, referring to the career of Alcibiades, and using the ideas expressed on the 'Superman' by the *Anonymus Iamblichi* at the end of the fifth century, makes his theme live. Herr Heintzeler analyses the relevant passages in the *Gorgias* accurately; but he breathes no life into his analysis. It is the same with his account of Plato's own views. The account gives an accurate summary, and it proceeds correctly, in point of chronology, from the *Gorgias* to the *Republic*, from the *Republic* to the *Politics*, and from the *Politics* to the *Laws*. The different views presented in the different dialogues are correctly stated; and the whole statement of Plato's views is carefully related to the facts of his life which may be gathered from the *Epistles*. But the general point of view is too much that of a simple antithesis between *Machtpolitik* and *Staatsethik*; and Plato is hardly treated with a genuine sympathy which follows the windings of a troubled mind, and traces its twists and turns genetically. The truth is that the Socratic teaching, with its emphasis on the *Fachmann* in politics, had something of a monarchical trend. It was anti-democratic enough to get near to a sort of tyranny. Sometimes the

tyranny is one of principle, sometimes it almost becomes personal; but in one form or another tyranny attracts, and at the same time repels. On the one hand the philosopher rejects the institution as it stands; on the other he feels that it may be the way of salvation if only this wild force can be mastered and ridden by philosophy. It is this twisting and turning—this attempt to have the good of tyranny and at the same time to reject tyranny—which is the fascination of Plato. Perhaps it is only age, and the experience it brings, that can give insight into the growth of a thinker's mind and the development of his thought. Herr Heintzeler was young when he wrote this little book, and he brought to it some of the best qualities a young man can bring—accurate scholarship, industrious reading, and a faith in ideals. We can only, at the end, write over the one monument he left the word of praise which it deserves.

ERNEST BARKER.

*Platone: la Repubblica.* Passi scelti e annotati con introduzione e sommaria esposizione del dialogo: a cura di UGO ENRICO PAOLINI. Pp. xxi+lx+123. Firenze: Felice le Monnier, 1927.

THIS is a judicious selection for use in schools. Perhaps rather too much of Book I. has been given and rather too little of Book V., which is represented only by pages 469B-471C. The notes are clear and concise, the summary full and excellent. Burnet's text is generally followed, and particular acknowledgment is made of the edition of Jowett and Campbell. The introduction lays emphasis on the light which the dialogue throws on various aspects of Greek history.

R. HACKFORTH.

*The Works of Aristotle translated into English.* Vol. VIII.: *Metaphysica.* By W. D. ROSS. M.A. Second edition. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1928. 10s. 6d. net.

WHEN noticing the first edition of this admirable translation nearly twenty years ago in the columns of the *C.R.* we had to complain that the authority for the lection adopted was not invariably stated. For this complaint there is no longer any ground. For, as Mr. Ross states in his short Preface to this edition, his translation follows the text published (with a commentary) by himself in 1924, except in the few instances where he has changed his opinion since that date, and these instances are clearly indicated in footnotes. Thus the translation is brought thoroughly up to date; and, taken in conjunction with the text and commentary, it constitutes a most valuable contribution to the study of Ancient Philosophy, for which (as we said aforetime) Mr. Ross deserves our warm thanks, and the congratulations of all who appreciate accurate thinking and fine scholarship.

R. G. BURY.

*Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen.* Von R. LAQUEUR. Pp. v+211. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1927. Paper, 10 RM.; bound, 12 RM.

IN view not only of the number of extant Greek decrees, but also of their value as historical



sources, we may extend a warm welcome to any work which, like that now before us, enables us to understand better their structure, and interpret more exactly their meaning. The author makes no attempt to traverse afresh the whole ground covered by H. Swoboda's *Die griechischen Volksbeschlüsse*, although he would have been justified in doing so in consideration of all the accessions made to our materials and to our knowledge by the discoveries and the studies of the thirty-eight years which have elapsed since that book was published. He confines himself rather to one question—how we may discern in decrees the presence of amendments appended to or inserted in the original *προβουλεύματα*, but not expressly described as such. Various symptoms are held to indicate the influence of such amendments; among them are the duplication of the formula *δεδοχθαι τῷ δήμῳ*, additions following the clause providing for the publication of the decree and occasionally relating to a later time than the main proposal, insertions which are either logically or grammatically inconsistent with the text in which they are incorporated, repetitions of the same idea in different words, and the presence of intrusive elements breaking up fixed formulae. Under each heading Professor Laqueur examines a number of decrees which, in his view, betray these symptoms, while an appendix is devoted to a detailed analysis of the Testament of Epicteta and the appended statute of the society founded by her, in which he distinguishes three separate and successive stages. In a brief epilogue he indicates the relation of this investigation and its results to the textual criticism of MSS., maintaining that 'the lessons drawn from our treatment of inscriptions tend to strengthen our confidence in the manuscript tradition, even in cases where logic apparently demands its emendation' (p. 205).

The author argues fully, clearly, and logically, and many of his conclusions seem to be alike valid and valuable. If at times he fails to carry conviction, it is not because we challenge his reasoning, but rather because we cannot accept with his confidence the basic assumption that a *προβούλευμα* must have lacked those elements of inconsistency and illogicality which, when they appear in decrees, are attributed by the author to the hasty or imperfect incorporation of amendments in the original proposals.

The index of inscriptions discussed, which concludes the work, is invaluable but unhappily not flawless. *O.G.I.* 777 should be 771, *I.G.* xi. 4. 1053 is not dealt with on p. 209, and *I.G.* xii. 3. 30 is a false reference, taken over from p. 119, for 330. If errors are few, omissions abound, owing mainly to the system on which the index has been constructed. In the text an inscription is denoted by reference to one or more of the periodicals or collections in which it appears, but the references given for the same inscription differ in different parts of the text, and the needed adjustment has not been made in the compilation of the index. Thus, e.g., the famous decree constituting the Second Athenian Confederacy is referred to on p. 40 as *I.G.* ii.<sup>2</sup> 43 = *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 147, on p. 50 as *I.G.* ii.<sup>2</sup> 43; if, then, we wish to know where Professor

Laqueur discusses this decree, we shall find under *Syll.*<sup>3</sup> 147 the single reference to p. 40, and only if we happen to turn to *I.G.* ii.<sup>2</sup> 43 shall we be referred to p. 50 also.

MARCUS N. TOD.

*Encomium of Saint Gregory, Bishop of Nyssa, on his Brother, Saint Basil, Archbishop of Cappadocian Caesarea.* A Commentary, with a Revised Text, Introduction, and Translation. By SISTER JAMES ALOYSIUS STEIN. Pp. xcvi + 166. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America, 1928.

THIS doctor's dissertation is Vol. XVII. in the Patristic Studies of the Catholic University of America. The copious introduction deals with the subject-matter, grammar, vocabulary, and style of the work. Students of Gregory of Nyssa will welcome this continuation of the valuable work of Srawley, Jaeger, and Pasquali. The editor, however, seems to know little of the scope of the Berlin series of Ante-Nicene Greek Fathers, to judge by the remark on p. xxix; and there are too many misprints. Yet the work shows great industry and considerable care. It is made indispensable by the collations of six MSS. given here from photographs, the oldest being Codex Vaticanus Graecus 2086 (saec. IX.-X.). The commentary is full, and will be helpful to students of late Greek. On p. 124 the merely graphic variant *νεολεαν* for *νεολααν* is treated too seriously.

A. SOUTER.

*Grammatik der Neugriechischen Volkssprache.* Von A. THUMB. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage von J. E. KALITSUNAKIS. (Sammlung Götschen Bd. 756.) Pp. 176. Berlin and Leipzig: Walter de Gruyter and Co., 1928. R.M. 1.50.

THE second edition of Professor Thumb's useful little work, revised by Professor Kalitsunakis, will be welcomed as an authoritative and handy pocket guide to the popular speech of Modern Greece, and as a companion volume to Professor Kalitsunakis' *Grammatik der Neugriechischen Schriftsprache* recently noticed in this journal (p. 153). It contains an excellent bibliography and specimen texts.

The promoters of the Sammlung Götschen have done well to recognise that in Modern Greece there are two distinct languages—a popular spoken language, used also to a limited extent in literature, especially in poetry, and a language used in official documents, the Press, and all learned and scientific publications. Attempts to compile a single grammar to deal with both types of language have only led to confusion and to the presentation of a false idea of Modern Greek. Anyone who wishes to realise the wide gulf which separates the popular from the learned language has only to compare the two versions of the same content on p. 171 of the present work.

For a more detailed discussion of popular Modern Greek scholars will still refer to Professor Thumb's larger *Handbuch*.

E. S. FORSTER.

*P. Cornelii Taciti Historiarum libri qui supersunt.* Erklärt von EDUARD WOLFF. Zweiter Band: Buch III., IV., und V. Zweite Auflage, besorgt von Georg Andresen. Pp. 304. 8vo. Berlin; Weidmann, 1926. Paper. M. 7.50.

THIS handy volume forms one of the Haupt-Sauppe collection of Classical Authors with German Commentary. In this edition greater attention is given to subject-matter than was given in the first, and less to linguistic and rhetorical detail. This has involved the dele-

tion of certain notes for purely school use, and the revision and alteration of others. More use is made of inscriptions, and citations have been carefully revised, and in many cases corrected. The text printed, save in nine instances, is Halm's, but doubtful readings and conjectures, in some cases original, find their due place in the commentary, and in one or two cases also a different interpretation from Wolff's is given. The commentary is attractively arranged for practical use, and of special value is the most careful and comprehensive index.

W. W. GRUNDY.

## SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

### PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JANUARY—JUNE, 1928.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—*Aristophanes' Lysistrate*, erklärt von U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf [Berlin, 1927, Weidmann. Pp. 223] (Wüst). Masterly commentary, amazingly full and many-sided.—W. Porzig, *Die antike Tragödie des Aischylos (Staat und Geist, Arbeiten im Dienste der Besinnung und des Aufbaus, Bd. III.)* [Leipzig, 1926, Wiegandt. Pp. 214] (Körte). Reviewer criticises at length mistakes in method and in results, and doubts if it serves the purpose the series professes.—*Lysias, Discours, Tome II. (XVI.-XXXV. et fragments)*. Texte ét. et trad. par L. Gernet et M. Bizo [Paris, 1926, Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. 302] (Ammon). Carefully considered text and apparatus; translation shows thorough knowledge of language and subject matter. Very instructive and stimulating.—*Bucoliques Grecs, Tome II. Pseudo-Théocrite, Moschos, Bion, divers*. Texte ét. et trad. par P. E. Legrand [Paris, 1927, Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres' (Morel). Treatment of text open to grave objections; but the book is recommended because of its excellent introduction, happy translation, and relevant notes.—R. Löhrer, *Mienenspiel und Maske in der griechischen Tragödie* [Paderborn, 1927, Schöningh. Pp. xvi + 192] (Schneider). Very considerable achievement in spite of some blemishes. Tragedians examined in detail; problem of the *Rhesus* touched upon.

LATIN LITERATURE.—I. G. Scott, *The Grand Style in the Satires of Juvenal*. *Smith College Classical Studies, Vol. VIII.* [Northampton, 1927. Pp. 118] (Hosius). Skillful and plausible, though rather too one-sided in practically only comparing epic style.—*Aurelii Prudentii Clementis Carmina. Corpus script. eccles. lat. Vol. LXI.* Rec. et prolegomenis, comment. crit., indicibus instr. G. Bergman [Wien, Holder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. lvi + 578] (Manitius). Worthy companion to the best editions in this series.—A. Klotz, *Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense* [Leipzig, 1927, Teubner. Pp. vi + 120] (Helm). Useful commentary, with helpful introductory survey of the literary problems, and a most valuable contribution on military and topographical

questions by General Lammerer.—*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*. Ed. E. Hohl [Vol. I. Pp. xvi + 305; Vol. II. Pp. 304] (Klotz). The merits of this urgently needed new edition are considerable, though it does not fulfil every expectation. The MS. tradition at least has now been cleared up in principle and many improvements have been made in text. Reviewer goes into question of MSS. in some detail.—*Cicéron, Discours, Tome V.: Seconde Action contre Verrès, Livre IV.* Texte ét. par H. Bornecque et trad. par G. Rabaud [Paris, 1927, Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. xxv + 151] (Klotz). Useful edition, though it does not contain anything new.—*Pline le jeune, Lettres, Tome I.: Livres I.-III.* Texte ét. et trad. par A. M. Guillemin [Paris, 1927, Société d'Édition 'Les Belles Lettres.' Pp. lii + 146] (Klotz). In general satisfies requirements. Critical apparatus might be clearer; text better than Merrill's.—A. Klotz, *C. Iulii Caesaris commentarii. Vol. II.: Commentarii Belli Civilis. Vol. III.: Commentarii Belli Alexandrini, Belli Africi, Belli Hispaniensi; accedunt C. Iulii Caesaris et A. Hirti fragmenta* [Leipzig, 1926 and 1927, Teubner. Pp. xiv + 184 and xvi + 248] (Kalinka). K. has provided a good and reliable edition. Introduction to Vol. III. contains a conscientious examination of the MS. tradition.

HISTORY.—E. Täubler, *Tyche. Historische Studien* [Leipzig, 1926, Teubner. Pp. 240] (Hohl). Eight essays (Roman constitution, Polybius, Palestine, Orgetorix, etc.), containing a wealth of shrewd observations.—S. Feist, *Germanen und Kellen in der antiken Überlieferung* [Halle, 1927, Niemeyer. Pp. iv + 75] (L. Schmidt). As late as Tacitus Celtic tribes lived on west bank of the Elbe and were called Germani by the related Galli. Reviewer cannot accept F.'s views.—F. Focke, *Herodot als Historiker* [Stuttgart, 1927, Kohlhammer. Pp. 58] (Taeger). Reviewer welcomes this searching analysis.—H. Licht, *Sittengeschichte Griechenlands. In zwei Bänden und einem Ergänzungsband. I. Die griechische Gesellschaft. II. Das Liebesleben der Griechen* [Pp. 319 and 266, and 500 plates and figures] (Lamer). Recommended as a frank treatment of a subject, the importance of which in estimating Greek life is still in

- sufficiently realised.—*Ἑπὶ τὸ μῖον* Heinrich Svoboda dargebracht [Reichenberg, 1927, Gebr. Stiepel. Pp. xiv + 385] (Ensztlin). Contains a great variety of contributions, which reviewer summarises.—F. Stähelin, *Die Schweiz in römischer Zeit* [Basel, 1927, Schwabe. Pp. xvi + 549. With 172 figures, 1 map, and 3 plans] (Gelzer). Two main parts, pre-Roman (pp. 1-293) and Roman (pp. 297-506), with a topographical appendix (pp. 509-535). Exact in method and clear in exposition. Very highly praised.—E. Täubler, *Die Archäologie des Thukydides* [Leipzig, 1927, Teubner. Pp. iv + 139] (Ammon). Informative and stimulating.
- PHILOSOPHY.—C. Schrempf, *Sokrates. Seine Persönlichkeit und sein Glaube* [Stuttgart, 1927, Frommann. Pp. 184] (Nestle). Warmly recommended as a portrait of the real Socrates.
- RELIGION.—*Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte, begründet von Chantepie de la Saussaye. Vierte, vollständig neubearbeitete Auflage.* Herausg. von A. Bertholet und E. Lehmann [Tübingen, 1925, Mohr. Pp. viii + 756 and viii + 732] (Pfister). Completely new work, of which all concerned in its production may be proud. Contains chapters on Greek Religion by Nilsson, and on Roman Religion by Deubner.
- LANGUAGE.—B. Meinersmann, *Die lateinischen Wörter und Namen in den griechischen Papyri* [Leipzig, 1927, Dieterich. Pp. xii + 124] (Stein). Useful collection of material, but explanatory section would have gained by survey of wider field than papyri alone.—P. Lieger, *J. Cornus, Beiträge zur lateinischen Metrik. Eine Kritik und Würdigung mit Ergänzungen aus dem Nachlasse* [Wien, 1927, Holder-Pichler-Tempsky. Pp. 72] (Klotz). Deals largely with accent in hexameter. L. deserves thanks for editing hitherto unpublished material, even if it is in many instances not yet completely worked through.
- EPIGRAPHY.—R. Laqueur, *Epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den griechischen Volksbeschlüssen* [Leipzig, 1927, Teubner. Pp. iv + 211] (Klaffenbach). In spite of weaknesses contains much that is excellent and of real value.

## BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

\*.\* Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Allen (P. S.) *The Romanesque Lyric. Studies in its background and development from Petronius to the Cambridge Songs, 50-1050.* With renderings into English verse by H. M. Jones. Pp. xviii + 373. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Beazley (J. D.) *Greek Vases in Poland.* Pp. xvi + 87; 32 plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Boards, 42s. net.
- Bevan (E.) *Sibyls and Seers. A Survey of Some Ancient Theories of Revelation and Inspiration.* Pp. 189. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Blakeney (E. H.) *The Ninth Philippic Oration of Marcus Tullius Cicero, with a Letter of Consolation from Sulpicius to Cicero.* Pp. 39. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1928. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Blegen (C. W.) *Zygouries. A prehistoric settlement in the valley of Cleonae.* Pp. xviii + 227; XXII plates, 199 figures. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press, 1928. Cloth.
- Classical Philology.* Vol. XXIII., No. 3. July, 1928.
- Corder (P.) *Roman Malton and District. Report No. 1. The Roman Pottery at Crambeck, Castle Howard.* Pp. 45; map, plates, and plans. York: The Ebor Press, 1928. Paper.
- Dale (A. M.) *A Junior Ancient History.* Pp. viii + 224; 5 maps. London: Methuen, 1928. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Delorme (F. M.) *Opera hactenus inedita* Rogeri Baconi Fasc. VIII. *Questiones supra libros quatuor Physicorum Aristotelis.* Nunc primum edidit F. M. D. collaborante R. Steele. Pp. xxii + 284. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Paper, 25s. net.
- De Rosa (E.) *De litteris Latinis commentarii libri V ad criticam artis rationem exacti.* Pp. x + 531. Trapani: 'Radio,' 1927. Paper.
- Eisler (R.) *ἸΗΣΟΥΣ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣ ΟΥ ΒΑΣΙΛΕΥΣΑΣ.* Lieferung 4/5. Pp. 241-400. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1928. Paper, RM. 5.50.
- Elmer (H. C.) *Latin Grammar.* Pp. xx + 327. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1928.
- Fokkinga (C.) *De praedicatieve plaatsing van het adjectief bij Lucianus.* Pp. xi + 85. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1928. Paper, 4s.
- Gennep (E. E.) *Selections from the Attic Orators.* Pp. vii + 255. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Ginsburg (M. S.) *Rome et la Judée.* Pp. 189. Paris: Povolozky, 1928. Paper.
- Hopkinson (J. H.) *The Roman Fort at Ribchester.* Third edition, revised and enlarged by D. Atkinson. Pp. 35. Manchester: University Press, 1928. Paper, 1s. net.
- Jouguet (P.) *Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East.* Pp. xx + 440; 7 plates, 4 maps, 1 plan. (The History of Civilization.) London: Kegan Paul, 1928. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Keith (A. B.) *A History of Sanskrit Literature.* Pp. xxxvi + 575. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Köhler (L.) *Die Briefe des Sokrates und der Sokratiker.* Pp. 142. (Philologus, Supple-

- mentband XX, Heft II.) Leipzig: Dieterich, 1928. Paper, RM. 10.50 (bound, 12.50).
- Liechtenhan* (E.) *Anthimi de Observatione Ciborum ad Theodoricum regem Francorum epistula. Recensuit E. L.* Pp. xix+57. (Corpus Medicorum Latinorum VIII 1.) Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1928. Paper, RM. 6 (bound, 7.50).
- Livingstone* (R. W.) *The Mission of Greece. Some Greek views of life in the Roman world.* Pp. xii+302; illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Longford* (C.) *Vespasian and some of his Contemporaries.* Pp. xv+191. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis and Co., 1928. Cloth.
- Malcovati* (E.) *Caesaris Augusti Imperatoris Operum Fragmenta iteratis curis collegit, recensuit, praefata est, appendicem criticam addidit H. M.* Pp. lxxiv+172. (Corpus Scr. Lat. Paravianum. N. 38.) L. 22.—Editio minor. Pp. 63. L. 4. Turin etc.: Paravia, 1928. Paper.
- Map of Roman Britain.* Scale: 16 miles to one inch. Second edition. Southampton: Ordnance Survey, 1928. Paper, 4s.
- Marchant* (E. C.) *Higher Unprepared Latin.* Pp. x+236. London: G. Bell, 1928. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Marschall* (T.) *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie der Werke Xenophons.* Pp. 104. Munich: Lehmaier, 1928. Paper.
- Meillet* (A.) *Esquisse d'une Histoire de la Langue latine.* Pp. viii+287. Paris: Hachette, 1928. Paper, 25 fr.
- Meritt* (B. D.) *The Athenian Calendar in the Fifth Century. Based on a study of the detailed account of money borrowed by the Athenian state, I.G.I<sup>3</sup>, 324.* Pp. 138; 11 plates. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press, 1928. Cloth.
- Mountford* (J. F.) and *Baillie Reynolds* (P. K.) *One Hundred Post-classical Latin Unseens.* Pp. x+69. Aberystwyth: S. V. Galloway. Paper, 2s. 6d.
- Mustard* (W. P.) *Aeneae Sylvii de Curialium Miseriis Epistola. Edited with introduction and notes.* Pp. 102. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 7s. net.
- Ohl* (R. T.) *The Enigmas of Symphosius.* Pp. 137. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1928. Paper.
- Osmaston* (F. P. B.) *Illuminated text and original translations from the Greek Dramatists with the 'Funeral Oration of Pericles,' and 'The Death of Socrates,' illustrated by hand reproductions of Greek Art and Landscapes. A new Presentation of Greek Art and Thought. The Handwork of a Hellenist. With a Preface by his wife and an Introduction by H. W. Nevinson.* London: Simpkin Marshall. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Párvan* (V.) *Dacia. An outline of the early civilizations of the Carpatho-Danubian countries.* Pp. x+216; 16 plates, 1 map. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Preisandans* (K.) *Papyri Graecae Magicae. Die griechischen Zauberpapyri herausgegeben u. übersetzt von K. P. unter Mitarbeit von A. Abt, S. Eitrem, L. Fahz, A. Jacoby, G. Möller, R. Wünsch.* Pp. xii+200; 111 plates. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1928. Paper, RM. 16 (bound, 18).
- Rand* (E. K.) *Founders of the Middle Ages.* Pp. xi+365. Cambridge, U.S.A.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Rendell* (A. W.) *Physiologus. A metrical bestiary of twelve chapters by Bishop Theobald, printed in Cologne 1492. Translated by A. W. R.* Pp. xxvii+32+100; illustrations. London: J. and E. Bumpus, 1928. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Robertson* (J. J.) *Higher Latin Sentences.* Pp. 32. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1928. Paper, 6d.
- Rose* (H. J.) *A Handbook of Greek Mythology.* Pp. viii+363. London: Methuen, 1928. 16s. net.
- Ross* (W. D.) *The Works of Aristotle, translated into English under the editorship of W.D.R. Volume I. Categoriae and De Interpretatione by E. M. Edghill. Analytica Priora by A. J. Jenkinson. Analytica Posteriora by G. R. G. Mure. Topica and De Sophisticis Elenchis by W. A. Pickard.* Cambridge: Oxford: Clarendon Press (London: Milford), 1928. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Ryba* (B.) *Dvě Konsolace Senekovy a jejich prameny. Deux Consolations de Sénèque et leurs Sources.* Pp. 101. (Facultas Philosophica Universitatis Carolinae Pragensis. XIX.) Prague: Fr. Řivnáč, 1928. Paper, 18 Kč.
- Salt* (H. S.) *The Story of Aeneas. Virgil's Aeneid translated into English Verse.* Pp. xv+304. Cambridge: University Press, 1928. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Sharp* (Sir H.) *The Agamemnon of Aeschylus. An English Version.* Pp. 73. London: Milford, 1928. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Siegfried* (W.) *Studien zur geschichtlichen Anschauung des Polybios.* Pp. viii+106. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1928. Paper, RM. 4.60.
- Stuart* (D. R.) *Epochs of Greek and Roman Biography.* Pp. vii+270. Berkeley: University of California Press (Cambridge: University Press), 1928. Cloth, 16s. 6d. net.
- The American Journal of Philology.* Vol. XLIX, 3. Whole No. 195. July, August, September, 1928.
- Thursby* (C. C.) and *Kyne* (G. D.) *Living Latin for the Junior High School. Book One.* Pp. xii+482; illustration. New York: Macmillan Company (London: Macmillan), 1928. Cloth, 6s.
- Ullman* (B. L.) *Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum Illustrum Latinae Linguae Libri XVIII.* Pp. lii+520; 5 plates. (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. VI.) Rome: American Academy, 1928. Cloth.
- Wells* (T. G.) *The Shorter Caesar (Civil War). Arranged and edited for the use of schools.* Pp. xviii+159. (Bell's Shorter Classics.) London: G. Bell and Sons, 1928. Cloth, 2s. 6d., with or without vocabulary.



JAN 10 1929